DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 604 AC 012 570

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | A Question of Stewardship. A Study of the Federal Role in Higher Continuing Education. |
| INSTITUTION | National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education. |
| PUB DATE | 31 Mar 72 |
| NOTE | 116p.; Sixth Annual Report |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Adult Education; Advisory Committees; Case Studies (Education); Community Services; Data Collection; Educational Programs; *Federal Government; *Government Role; *Higher Education; Interagency Coordination; Organizations (Groups); Research; *Role Perception; Universities |

ABSTRACT

The role of the Federal Government in Continuing Higher education is studied. The study contained three stages: (1) An identification was made and a description written of all those Federal programs that have a community service, extension or continuing education component that involves institutions of higher education; (2) A series of case studies was prepared on particular Federal programs which represented major areas of Federal support; and (3) Drawing on facts and information developed in the first two stages, a broad assessment was made of the Federal effort in extension, continuing education, and community service. The following activities are recommended: (1) To keep current the information assembled on the programs already identified and to record new program activities, (2) To establish more systematic liaison with other administrators of Office of Education programs, and (3) To study State plans, Title I projects, continuing education needs of women and prisoners, effects of federal programs on intra-and inter-university relationships, and quality control and consumer protection in higher continuing education. (Author/CK)

ED 062 604

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# a question of Stewardship

## A STUDY OF THE FEDERAL ROLE IN HIGHER CONTINUING EDUCATION

## 6th Annual Report

## AND RECOMMENDATIONS

OF THE

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

AA0125770

IT IS IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES THAT HIGHER EDUCATION RESOURCES BE DEVELOPED AND AUGMENTED TO THE END THAT LIFE-LONG LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL CITIZENS, REGARDLESS OF PREVIOUS EDUCATION OR TRAINING, BE WIDELY AVAILABLE TO PROMOTE THE CONTINUED VITALITY OF OUR FREE SOCIETY.

# 6th Annual Report

March 31, 1972

## AND RECOMMENDATIONS

OF THE

## NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

## THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

### PUBLIC MEMBERS

ROBERT F. RAY, Chairman
Iowa

*JOSEPH ALIOTO
California

CHARLES T. ANDREWS
Nebraska

DOROTHY J. BEWLEY
New York

ALBERT H. BOWKER
California

NEWTON O. CATTELL
Pennsylvania

RUTH CRASSWELLER
Minnesota

MARK GUERRA
California

*CYRIL O. HOULE
Illinois

*JESSE C. KELLAM
Texas

KENNETH T. LYONS
Massachusetts

JULIUS J. MASTRO
New Jersey

EARL NUNN
New Mexico

*FRANCISCO D. SANCHEZ, JR.
New Mexico

HOWARD WALKER
Kansas

FRANK J. VAN DYKE
Oregon

### GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

N. P. RALSTON
Department of Agriculture

ROGER A. PRIOR
Department of Commerce

NATHAN BRODSKY
Department of Defense

ANDREW T. BULLIS
Department of Housing and Urban Development

RICHARD C. CURRY
Department of Interior

GARLAND S. WOLLARD
Department of Justice

ROLAND G. ROSS
Department of Labor

GILBERT ANDERSON
Department of State

MARY E. ROBINSON
Office of Economic Opportunity

ARTHUR J. HARVITH
Small Business Administration

MARIE Y. MARTIN
Office of Education

### STAFF

EDWARD A. KIELOCH
Executive Director

RICHARD F. McCARTHY
Associate Director

KATHRYN L. MULLIGAN
Staff Associate

HARRIET M. CHADAYAMMURY
Administrative Assistant

*Public Members whose terms have expired during this reporting year

**THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965**
**SECTION 109**

The National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education ". . . shall review the administration and effectiveness of all federally supported extension and continuing education programs, including community service programs, make recommendations with respect thereto, and make annual reports. . . of its findings and recommendations to the Secretary (of Health, Education and Welfare) and to the President."

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT


Page

**INTRODUCTION** 1
Summary of current and proposed Council activities

**RECOMMENDATIONS** 3
Listing of recommendations, each followed by supporting text

**COMMENTS ON TITLE I, FISCAL YEAR 1971** 9
Summary of Title I activities and future prospects


## APPENDIX A

### Part I


**A QUESTION OF STEWARDSHIP**: A Study of the Federal Role in Higher Continuing Education

**Introduction** 12
Study approach and methodolology, together with a summary of Federal and university activity in extension, continuing education and community service

**Summary of Major Findings** 18
Program legislation, program administration, program characteristics and institutions of higher education

**A Focus on Issues** 20

**Coordination: Some Basic Problems in Public Administration** 20
Problems in achieving a coordinated Federal effort in extension, continuing education and community service

**The Legislative Base** 22
The origin and nature of legislation which created the programs reviewed

**The Administration of Educational Grant Programs: A New Feudalism** 24
Problems in administering relevant Federal grant programs

**Urban Extension: The Need for Structure** 32
Need for a better organized effort and a description of the present basis on which communitiy services programs operate

**The Federal Government and Student Financial Assistance** 35
A review of Federal support for higher education which basically neglects the part-time student

**Independent Study** 38
The present configuration and future prospects for home study

**Data Analysis and Program Clusters** 40
Analysis of programs supporting instructional services

Analysis of programs supporting research application

**Part II**

**Examination of Specific Programs and Areas of Program Concentration**


| | |
|---|---|
| Introduction | 53 |
| Cooperative Extension | 55 |
| National Sea Grant Program: Two Approaches to Extension Services | 60 |
| The Federal Government and the Training of Teachers and Educational Personnel | 65 |
| Regional Medical Programs: A Test of Local Initiative | 73 |
| Veterans Administration: The GI Bill: Education and Training | 78 |
| Legal Services: University as Advocate | 84 |
| Law Enforcement Assistance Administration: An Intergovernmental Challenge | 88 |
| Government Conducted Programs of Continuing Education | 92 |
| High Expectations and Modest Successes: Title I of The Higher Education Act of 1965 | 94 |


**APPENDIX B**


| | |
|---|---|
| A REPORT ON THE COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAM (TITLE I, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965) | 97 |

# INTRODUCTION

"Community service" is as ambiguous and inconclusive a term as is "continuing education." Neither lends itself to a brisk definition and yet each is a term heard increasingly in the deliberations of educators and community leaders who are concerned about the directions education and community life are taking.

We on this Council believe with conviction that the quality of American education and the tone of community life are inseparable, and that strengthening the continuing education and community service activities at our public and private colleges and universities is indispensible to an amelioration of some of our most critical community problems.

It is this Council's responsibility to advise the Commissioner of Education on the preparation of regulations and policies affecting the administration of Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended. This Council is also mandated to report to the President and the Congress on the administration and effectiveness of all Federally supported programs of extension, continuing education and community service.

In previous years, we have focused primary attention on the operation of Title I activities. During the past year, this Council has undertaken systematically the task of reviewing all Federally supported programs for which it has an over-sight responsibility.

As a result, we have now broadened the scope of our activities to the extent required by our statutory charter. While continuing to maintain familiarity with Title I activities, we have identified 142 other Federal programs which in whole or in part fund extension, continuing education and community services activities. We have formed some basic judgments about the administration and operation of these programs which represent a total outlay of over four billion dollars, with over one-half of this amount specifically allocated to activities involving extension, higher continuing education and community service. These judgments are reflected in our recommendations.

The study on which our recommendations are based proceeded in three stages. First, an identification was made and a description written of all those Federal programs that have a community service, extension or continuing education component that involves institutions of higher education. Second, a series of case studies was prepared on particular Federal programs which represented major areas of Federal support. And third, drawing on facts and information developed in the first two stages, we sought to present a broad assessment of the Federal effort in extension, continuing education and community service. *This study "A Question of Stewardship" is attached as Appendix A.*

Our efforts during the past year provide a base which will enable us to serve with increasing effectiveness the purposes for which this Council was established.

This Advisory Council is the only entity within the Government with a statutory charge to oversee the massive and scattered Federal effort in extension, continuing education and community service. Our expanded activities over the past year have given us a greater degree of visibility within and beyond the Federal structure. Individuals, institutions and associations concerned with higher continuing education have welcomed the Council's heightened activity and have warmly supported our efforts to gather and assess information.

In the coming year we propose, among other activities, to undertake the following:

1. As a first priority, to keep current the information we have assembled on the 143 Federal programs already identified, and to record new program activities, so that we can provide a solid factual basis on which to form judgments and render advice.

2. While continuing our close relationships with Title I, to establish more systematic liaison with other administrators of Office of Education programs, and with appropriate Federal agencies other than the Office of Education. There are many programs of high priority and substantial importance that should command a larger share of our attention.

3. To study:

(a) State plans submitted under Title I guidelines, so that we can develop more meaningful insights on which to assess shifts in emphasis and priorities.

(b) Representative projects funded by Title I, in order to experiment with more sophisticated evaluation techniques and to provide us with an independent basis on which to form judgments about the relative successes of these projects.

(c) The continuing education needs of particular clientele such as women, prisoners, and the educated unemployed.

(d) Activities not included in the present study, such as programs funded under contracts and programs of higher continuing education for military personnel and Federal employees.

(e) Effects of Federal programs on intra- and inter-university relationships.

(f) Programs of higher continuing education designed to prepare teachers who serve vocational education and adult basic education activities.

(g) Quality control and consumer protection in higher continuing education, particularly with respect to programs of individual study where long-standing problems in this regard exist.

(h) The accreditation of higher continuing education activities, with emphasis on accreditation of work toward external degrees.

4. In addition, during the course of the next year, we plan to initiate a series of regional conferences to bring together Federal administrators and representatives from institutions of higher education to discuss mutual problems and program concerns in higher continuing education. We believe that such conferences will help universities and the Federal Government to develop better forms of interaction and achieve more effective results.

Our activities during the past year as well as our hopes for the future are both reflected in our recommendations. In the course of further deliberation on the many programs identified in our study, and the many issues raised by it, we plan to formulate and submit additional recommendations prior to our next annual report.

# RECOMMENDATIONS

1. WE RECOMMEND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF KNOWLEDGE RECEIVING AND TRANSFERRING NETWORKS AT STATE, NATIONAL AND LOCAL LEVELS TO FORM A COHESIVE SYSTEM FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF PROBLEMS ON WHICH ACTION IS NEEDED, AND FOR THE ORGANIZATION OF RESEARCH EFFORTS AND THE TRANSFER OF KNOWLEDGE TO ITS ULTIMATE USERS.

TO THIS END, WE RECOMMEND THAT FIVE DEMONSTRATION EXTENSION PROGRAMS BE ESTABLISHED IN EACH OF FIVE STATES, AT UNIVERSITIES HAVING A PROVEN COMPETENCE IN EXTENSION ACTIVITIES. A DIFFERENT EXTENSION FOCUS WILL BE GIVEN AT EACH UNIVERSITY. THE FIVE AREAS OF FOCUS WE PROPOSE ARE: (1) UNIVERSITY EXTENSION ASSISTANCE TO VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS, SMALL AND MEDIUM-SCALE BUSINESSES AND INDUSTRIES IN MATTERS SUCH AS SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH, MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT; (2) UNIVERSITY EXTENSION ASSISTANCE TO MUNICIPAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ON THE TECHNICAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS WITH WHICH THESE LOCAL JURISDICTIONS ARE CONCERNED; (3) EXTENSION ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH SYSTEMS, DESIGNED TO INCORPORATE THE LATEST RESEARCH AND MEDICAL PRACTICES INTO THE ACTIVITIES OF PUBLIC HEALTH; (4) EXTENSION ASSISTANCE TO PUBLIC EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF TEACHING AND LEARNING AND (5) EXTENSION ASSISTANCE THROUGH A CONSORTIUM OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WITHIN A GIVEN STATE IN ONE OR MORE OF THE FOUR FUNCTIONAL AREAS CITED ABOVE. WE ASK THE PRESIDENT TO CALL UPON THE DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE TO DEVELOP WAYS OF MAKING THIS RECOMMENDATION OPERATIONAL THROUGH EXISTING AUTHORITIES OR BY THE PROPOSAL OF NEW LEGISLATION.

Many proposals have been made to reproduce in other functional areas an extension system comparable in size and composition to that established for agriculture within the land grant universities. For one or another reason, all these proposals have failed to gain acceptance, although small-scale extension activities, Federally funded, have been established for specific, limited-purpose programs. The reasons for failure appear to be: (1) the need for heavy fund outlays and long-term fund commitments if something on the scale of agricultural extension is to be done; (2) lack of agreement on what specific purposes any new extension system should fulfill and what clientele it should serve; (3) a lack of conviction that universities could be as successful in other program areas as they are in agriculture; (4) the political difficulties which would arise if a single institution in each State were selected for heavy Federal and State support, as in the case of agricultural extension, and (5) a recognition that if more than one institution per State were to be selected as an extension base, difficult coordination problems would arise and the total State grant might be dismembered, distributed in small amounts, and thereby lose the critical mass needed to give successful effect to a major extension effort.

These obstacles impeding major new extension efforts are real and based on reasonable grounds; yet a preoccupation with them has stifled action and progress. What is needed now is a limited breakthrough which can test, at modest cost and with minimum disruption, the broader application of the extension concept.

2. WE RECOMMEND THAT THE CONGRESS APPROPRIATE $20 MILLION IN FISCAL YEAR 1973, AND ADDITIONAL SUMS IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS TO ACHIEVE AN ORDERLY PROGRESSION TO THE AUTHORIZED LEVEL OF $60 MILLION BY FISCAL YEAR 1977, FOR THE SUPPORT OF THE EFFECTIVE STATE-GRANT PROGRAM OF COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION, UNDER TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED.

The Community Service and Continuing Education Program (Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965) has demonstrated its merit and is worthy of enlarged Federal support. Among all Federal programs surveyed, this program most specifically serves to focus the full range of university resources on community problem-solving through continuing education of individuals, groups and whole communities.

A letter dated February 11, 1972, addressed to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, conveys our views with respect to funding of Title I. In part, this letter states:

> *This Council is at complete odds with the decision to budget the Community Services Program at the $5.7 million level for Fiscal Year 1973. Established under Title I of the Higher Education Act, this program has successfully pioneered cooperative university-community efforts to cope with local problems of significant national importance. The record shows that activities begun under Title I auspices in drug abuse education, environmental degradation, training of local government officials and urban renewal have resulted in concrete accomplishments which laid a solid foundation for new legislation and expanded program activities in each of these functional areas.*
>
> *Title I has never been funded at its authorized level of $60,000,000. Even with the comparatively modest funds available, however, the program has made an impact which needs to be reinforced and expanded. Any final action to reduce appropriations below the present level would be a retrograde step inconsistent with our need to exert expanded efforts to mitigate serious social problems.*

In spite of serious financial restraints, the number of qualified institutions participating in the program has grown at a steady pace and, to a lesser extent, planning for Statewide programs has been accomplished in a significant number of States. State agencies, encouraged by program managers, have aided the development of cooperative arrangements among institutions of higher education. Such consortia-type arrangements are proving to be useful vehicles for applying a broad range of higher education resources to shared problems within a specific geographic area.

The recommended level of appropriation for FY 1973 (i.e., $20 million) can be used effectively to (1) ensure the continuation and refinement of significant program accomplishments, (2) strengthen existing networks for Statewide planning and administrative processes, and (3) implement a new program emphasis on meeting the continuing education needs of neglected groups of adults such as women, senior citizens, prisoners, minority entrepreneurs and the economically disadvantaged.

The States have employed Title I to address many of the most serious and intractable problems of communities at the community level. It is highly unrealistic to expect the limited resources made available to them to have had a conclusive or even measurable national impact on these problems. Although such problems may defy solution, credible paths toward solutions have been proved. Using the small projects that could be funded, people have been helped. Institutions of higher education have developed the tools and the base for achieving solutions when accorded resources commensurate with the scale of the task.

3. WE RECOMMEND THAT THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION ESTABLISH A DIVISION OF CONTINUING EDUCATION INTO WHICH CURRENT COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS CAN BE PLACED RATIONALLY AND ADMINISTERED EFFECTIVELY. SUCH A STRUCTURE WOULD PERMIT A COORDINATED AND TIMELY OFFICE OF EDUCATION RESPONSE TO CRITICAL NEEDS FOR HIGHER CONTINUING EDUCATION SERVICES.

There is currently in operation a variety of Federal programs which include virtually every category of higher continuing education. It is also evident that the specialized scope of many discrete programs has led to fragmented and uncoordinated administration. As the Council continues its study of Federally supported continuing education, further recommendations will be made about more rational administration of existing programs that have large continuing education components.

We are convinced that a start in this direction can be made in the Office of Education through an organizational arrangement that reflects the growing importance of continuing education for adults.

4. WE RECOMMEND THAT THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION USE THE PROPOSED DIVISION OF CONTINUING EDUCATION TO PROVIDE A LIAISON FUNCTION BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION SEEKING INFORMATION, PROPOSAL ASSISTANCE OR GRANTS AND THE AGENCIES AND PERSONS WITHIN THE GOVERNMENT WHO CAN ACT ON SUCH REQUESTS. SUCH A LIAISON FUNCTION IS CLEARLY NEEDED FOR ALL PROGRAMS OF EXTENSION, CONTINUING EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICE.



Page 11

In many cases, university involvement in Federal programs is obtained through the project grant mechanism. Further, many agencies fund projects which are similar in purpose, design and objective to projects funded by other agencies.

The processes through which universities seek and eventually find the appropriate person in the proper agency willing to fund their projects are wasteful, ineffective and subject to various abuses. The primary fault is lack of a central point within the Federal government to which colleges and universities can turn in order to determine which person in what agency they should contact to obtain consideration of their project proposals. What is lacking, in short, is a liaison office to which universities can address inquiries and send project proposals, with the assurance that they will come to the attention of the right people in the appropriate place.

5. WE RECOMMEND THAT EACH AGENCY BE REQUIRED TO ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF EVALUATION STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR HIGHER CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND FOR THE DISSEMINATION OF EVALUATION RESULTS. AGENCIES SHOULD COOPERATE WITH THIS COUNCIL IN DEVELOPING EVALUATION STANDARDS AND IN MAKING EVALUATION RESULTS AVAILABLE WITHIN AND OUTSIDE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

The pattern of evaluation of higher continuing education is inconsistent throughout the government in terms of standards, purpose and depth. Most frequently what passes for evaluation is either a budgetary review designed to justify the stewardship of Federal administrators or to provide justification for their *a priori* decisions on program continuation or termination. The results of substantive evaluations which do occur are often neither used internally for program improvement, nor are they disseminated in a systematic way to the academic community and other agencies having relevant interest. This lack of systematic evaluation simply precludes the kinds of intra- and inter-agency comparisons of similar programs which would result in shared learning, sound planning and effective decision-making.

6. WE RECOMMEND THAT THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET STUDY (1) PROGRAM FUND MATCHING RATIOS; (2) PROGRAM OVERHEAD RATES; (3) PROGRAM ACCOUNTING, AND (4) OTHER REGULATIONS GOVERNING HIGHER CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS, AND DEVELOP APPROPRIATE REMEDIES THAT WILL PROVIDE CONSISTENCY REGARDING HIGHER CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS WHICH USE SIMILAR EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES.

Many of the programs reviewed in this study require some kind of matching support by the grantee under various formulas devised by the Congress and/or Federal agencies. These matching requirements are intended to establish a program commitment on the part of the grantee by requiring the grantee to contribute to the total program costs. In theory, two worthwhile purposes are therefore served: there is some assurance that the grantee has a serious interest in the program, and the impact of Federal dollars is increased by contributions in dollars or in kind from the grantee.

In many instances such matching requirements work well and achieve the two primary purposes they are designed to serve. However, it is also evident that there is no consistent rationale for requiring matching contributions by the grantee, whether it be a State, community or academic institution. Similar kinds of programs have very different matching arrangements. A high match may be required in one instance and a low match or no provision for matching in another.

Similarly, many different administrative formulas are devised to fix the amount of overhead which a university will receive in connection with work on Federally funded projects. These overhead costs often constitute a significant percentage of total Federal funds allotted to higher education and are a source of much misunderstanding and acrimony.

7. WE RECOMMEND ENACTMENT OF A HIGHER CONTINUING EDUCATION ACT OF 1972. WE PROPOSE THAT TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT BE AMENDED AND TO THAT END AN OUTLINE OF SUCH PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOLLOWS, TOGETHER WITH OUR SUPPORTING REASONS.

Federal support today funds a vast variety of university public service activities ranging from providing legal assistance to the poor to studying the effects of environmental changes on biological systems and human health. These university-based activities reflect a growing cooperation between universities and the Federal government in wholly new areas of concern. Although these new patterns of cooperation have not yet taken optimal shape, it is clear that they are proving mutually advantageous to the university and the Federal government.

The Federal government has had substantial experience in providing funds to universities to engage in research in space, defense, agriculture and medicine. In these programs, ample funds are typically made available to universities to strengthen their research capacity and institutional base. The rationale for strengthening institutional and research capacity was simple, direct and based on the common sense notion that an improved capability to do research resulted in the delivery of a better research product to the Federal government. *However, when during the past decade the Federal government massively involved universities in Federally supported social programs, relative-*

*ly little attention was given to strengthening the university's capacity to deliver an effective product.* The probable reason for this is that much social legislation was enacted in response to immediate problems which threatened to reach crisis proportions; therefore, an immediate product to meet a short-term goal was desired of universities. The immediacy of response became more important than the quality of response, and the short-term nature of many social programs militated against the notion that universities should build a stable and improved capacity to serve the needs of these Federal programs over the long run.

Concurrent with this greater use of the university to ameliorate social problems has been a growing trend to prolong the educational process for the individual. Three major social forces have created an environment in which education is beginning to be viewed as a life-long process. This society is increasingly leisure-oriented and individuals are searching for opportunities for personal growth and enrichment through education. The complexity of national and community issues makes the task of developing an informed citizenry more difficult than even a decade ago when many of these issues were ignored. Finally, the growth of knowledge and of technological change quickly outdates professional skills and produces rapid shifts in labor market needs.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966 and the Vocational Education Act of 1963 have contributed substantially to the provision of continuing education opportunities, primarily for individuals at the secondary level of education. Universities have assisted in these efforts by training personnel in relevant fields and by designing and evaluating effective programs. A further emphasis on financial support by the Federal government to institutions and individuals which facilitates the expansion and improvement of higher continuing education opportunities is urgently needed.

This legislative proposal would strengthen university capacity to contribute more effectively to the various public service programs in which universities participate. In addition, it would create the institutional strength needed to expand continuing education efforts in other ways which would broadly serve the national interest. A number of specific areas of need have been identified.

*Fellowships in Higher Continuing Education* – The field of higher continuing education has traditionally been peripheral to the major purposes of the university. As such it has drawn its staff from other departments of the university and outside agencies or organizations. Financial rewards and opportunities for career advancement have been nominal in comparison with those available to faculty involved in the more traditional roles of the university. Although dramatically new and varied demands are being made of higher continuing education, there has been little recognition of the importance of developing a cadre of skilled practitioners in this field.

*Fellowships for Counselors* – Counseling is one of the most critical areas within the larger higher continuing education field. While counseling services are readily available to students following a traditional academic pattern, adults who return to higher education often have had to cope alone with vastly more difficult financial and academic problems. There is great need for counselors who understand the labyrinth of accreditation arrangements and the personal hardships of those returning to higher education.

*Individual Student Assistance* – The difficulties in making a commitment to change a life-style and return to higher education are compounded when financial assistance is unavailable.

Rapid changes in technology and shifting labor market needs quickly outdate skills learned a decade before. During the same time than an individual's skills are becoming obsolete, however, he is accumulating responsibilities which make it impossible for him to return to higher education without financial assistance. A woman who wants to return to higher education after her early years of child-rearing responsibilities has the additional problem of adding to the family's financial burdens at the time when family expenses are most severe.

Business men are encouraged to improve their companies by allowing tax credits for the cost of that improvement. A similar model should be developed to encourage the improvement of human talent. Investment in education should be regarded as a capital investment with appropriate compensation for subsequent depreciation. An individual who wants to return to higher education should be encouraged to borrow the necessary funds, both for tuition and living expenses, and then be allowed to charge this expense as a tax credit on his earnings after the educational experience is over.

## Individual Instruction

A major challenge to higher continuing education is to develop ways of reaching all people with programs of self-study and individualized instruction. External Degree programs, with their emphasis on learning packages and accreditation of various forms of learning experiences, are a beginning step in this direction. Greater use must be made of existing educational technology. Major obstacles to a return to higher education, cost and inconvenience, could be surmounted by the development of educational programs which draw upon existing technological developments which range from television to cassette recordings. Opportunities to enhance learning and education have been neglected because the organized, large-scale effort needed to provide the "software" components of mass education has not yet been made.

## Extension of Research Results

The National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges estimates that a national investment in research and development of $2 billion has been matched

by an investment of perhaps $25 million for application. When, during the past several decades, universities were extensively involved in research for the national defense, emphasis on extension was unnecessary and, in fact, undesirable since many of the research results were necessarily classified. Now, however, universities are focusing on social and community problems. Results of research in these areas must be widely disseminated in order to reach decision makers in appropriate agencies and local communities and to inform the general public about policy alternatives. The development of research proposals by universities and their review by Federal officials have not, however, been accompanied by a focus on research application and implementation.

## Program Development Assistance

Certain groups within society have special needs for higher education opportunities. We call special attention to:

(1) Women who want to attend universities on a part-time basis while rearing their children or to return to higher education after their child-rearing responsibilities are over have unique educational needs.

(2) Ways need to be found to reach community leaders with appropriate educational programs focusing on national goals and priorities. If our society is to be successful in improving the quality of life, persons in leadership roles will need better access to knowledge about the challenges and opportunities we face. There is a need to forge strong links between the intellectual community and those public and private leaders whose advice and action shape the structure and direction of community life. Communication between thinkers and doers is essential to them both, and creative steps to promote this dialogue are vitally necessary.

(3) Recent unemployment problems among highly trained scientists and engineers point up the need for programs of higher continuing education which can provide new specialties to professional workers whose current specialties offer few immediate prospects for employment. The tragic inability of our universities to respond quickly and imaginatively to this problem has resulted in a waste of human talent, a loss of productivity and severe personal hardships.

## Outline of Proposal

*Title:* The Higher Continuing Education Act of 1972.

*Policy:* It is in the national interest of the United States that higher education resources be developed and augmented to the end that lifelong learning opportunities for all citizens, regardless of previous education or training, be widely available to promote the continued vitality of our free society.

*Purpose:* (1) To strengthen the capacity of colleges and universities to perform effectively within the broad range of Federally supported "community services" programs, and (2) to enable colleges and universities to: (a) generally make available higher continuing education opportunities to the people; (b) develop programs designed to serve those who exercise leadership in our society; (c) foster continuing education programs which provide lateral and vertical occupational mobility; and (d) supply supportive service to other institutions and organizations which provide the people continuing education opportunities.

*Justification:* Numerous Federal programs involve universities in the development and transfer of knowledge relevant to various national needs. The transfer of knowledge to the ultimate users through programs of extension and continuing education is the vital link between the university's reservoir of knowledge and those who must apply this knowledge to community and national problems. Unless this transfer is accomplished effectively, the contributions which universities can make toward meeting social needs are severely impaired.

Historically, the Federal government has helped strengthen the extension and continuing education activities of institutions responsible for agricultural extension programs. Through these programs, university extension resources have been brought to bear on improving agricultural production, farm income and rural living standards. The demonstrated success of agricultural extension efforts must be replicated in other functional areas of national concern. Apart from agricultural extension, no other major Federal efforts to develop the capacity of universities to provide similar public services have been attempted; rather, through a series of *ad hoc* Federal programs universities have increasingly become involved in public service activities which they are often ill-prepared to carry out because they lack sufficient capacity to extend knowledge beyond the campus. In view of the Federal government's expenditure of several billion dollars per year in applying university resources to national needs, this statute intends to make the necessary investment in improving the university's ability to transfer knowledge to the ultimate user. This transfer of knowledge is the task of extension and continuing education.

*Specific Provisions:* To help higher education become a more effective resource in the solution of national problems and to foster expanded and improved opportunities for life-long learning. Without indicating an order of priority, the following provisions should be enacted:

1. *Financial Support:* Adults involved in post-secondary education on a full- or part-time basis will be eligible for financial assistance according to personal need. There are many statutes that could be amended to allow need-based support for higher continuing education tuition grants and loans for part-time or full-time adult students involved in college and university programs for credit and not for credit. Among these are the Social Security Act, the Economic Opportunity Act, the student aid provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as amended) and the Internal Revenue Code.

2. *Improved Resources for Individualized Instruc-*

*tion:* The potential for individualized instruction or remote education will be researched in depth in order to provide the most effective development of "learning packages" which use the new technology of audio-cassettes, video tape recordings and broadcasting in concert with correspondence and other forms of self learning. The objective is to foster independent instruction and to make learning opportunities more readily available–at a reasonable cost–for those individuals in society who are not being served by the more "traditional" systems of instruction. Federal support is needed for the design of educational programs, materials and mechanisms to serve the continuing education needs of adults as these relate to home and family life, civic participation, and job responsibility.

3. *Fellowships to Expand the Faculty Base:* Up to three hundred graduate fellowships will be awarded each year for five years to persons who now pursue or plan to pursue a career in extension and higher continuing education. These fellowships will bear stipends of up to $5,000 for each academic year of work, will be available for graduate work at both the masters and doctoral levels, and will be tenable only at accredited institutions offering a specialization in higher continuing education. Each fellowship may be for up to two academic years of graduate training, or the equivalent in part-time academic work.

4. *Counseling:* The educational counseling services needed by adult students continuing their education differ markedly from those required by regular on-campus students. To increase the number of skilled counselors for adults to advise on educational programs, each institution conferring advanced degrees in educational counseling will be eligible for fellowships which it can award to graduate students at that institution. There will be one hundred fellowships available each year for five years, bearing stipends of up to $5,000 each.

5. *Disseminating Results of Federally-Funded Research Programs:* Except when inconsistent with other requirements of law, preference in awarding research grants will be given to those projects or institutions which combine research with well-developed plans and capabilities for best extending the results of research to the appropriate clientele. In awarding research grants to institutions of higher education, in any field related to "community service" as defined by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, each awarding Federal agency will first determine what continuing education and extension activities are appropriate to the specific grant involved.

6. *Program Development Assistance:* Institutions and consortia may apply for project grants designed to help meet the costs of developing and delivering new programs and program concepts for educational efforts designed to: meet the continuing education needs of women; meet the continuing education needs of community leaders; and meet the continuing education needs of scientists, engineers, and other professionals whose skills have become obsolete or surplus as a result of structural changes in the economy.

7. *Advisory Functions:* The National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education will be renamed the National Advisory Council on Lifelong Learning and its legislative charter will be revised accordingly. A sum of $250,000 will be made available to the National Advisory Council on Lifelong Learning from funds appropriated under this Act for the purpose of making or cooperating in making relevant studies, investigations and reports and for the purpose of paying the salaries of the officers, the assistants and other necessary administrative expenses.

8. *Administration:* This statute will be administered by the Office of Education.

# COMMENTS ON TITLE I, FISCAL YEAR 1971

Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as amended) is a classic example of a concept initially well conceived, enacted into law, and then allowed to atrophy for want of adequate funding.

As originally conceived, Title I was intended to couple the resources of the nation's universities with the needs of local communities in a common effort to test and demonstrate workable solutions to urban and community problems. The example of the Cooperative Extension Service, where a similar effort was designed to alleviate the problems of rural America, served as an historically successful precedent for the Title I experiment.

The Congress authorized $60 million for this program, yet the program has never been allocated more than $10 million. It was necessary to distribute this small sum to all fifty States, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that Title I has had only a limited impact on the wide range of urban and suburban problems it seeks to address. What is surprising is that in State after State, Title I funds have produced important successes and that despite demonstrations of success, the program remains under an annual threat of a reduced budget or complete termination.

The Office of Education has shown little inclination to accord Title I a high priority or to seek vigorously to develop the program to its full potential. In part this may result from the fact that the kinds of projects funded by Title I deal with crime, delinquency, urban renewal, municipal management and other areas of concern which do not mesh well with the basic functional responsibilities of the Office of Education. As a result, Title I is viewed as an activity of fringe, rather than central, concern.

Because Title I is a cooperative effort, commitments to it by the States, by universities and by local communities are essential. The extent of these commitments, however, is contingent upon a clearly expressed and convincing commitment by the Office of Education. Because Title I has never been able to receive such a commitment–its funding history is dramatic proof of this–universities and State and local governments are annually confronted with uncertainties about what level of funds will be available or whether their plans for the coming year will in fact be funded at all.

There is no doubt Title I has suffered as a result. It is our conviction that long-term and stable funding are necessary if sound planning and more effective implementation of the program are to occur. States simply cannot plan very well or very far in advance if the flow of Title I funds continues to experience the same degree of last-minute uncertainty as in the past.

Over the past five years, this Council has repeatedly recommended that Title I be funded, tested and implemented at a realistic level. We have consistently believed that the operating format of Title I provides an ideal approach for uniting State planning, community initiative and university resources. In effect, Title I represents a unique model for revenue sharing which combines Statewide planning, local action and Federal dollars for purposes important both locally and nationally. We believe that Title I is too rarely perceived in this light. Rather than seen as a tested example of revenue sharing, it is often regarded as simply a source of funds for a variety of disjointed projects. This may be another reason for the low priority it commands within the Office of Education and the low level of funding it receives through the appropriations processes.

Title I is snared in a cyclical argument: low funding encourages support of small projects which leads to criticisms that Title I is not serving well its larger objectives. This in turn reinforces a continuation of low funding levels. Title I, if it is to prove itself, must be freed from the effects of such circular reasoning and, with expanded funding, given an opportunity to prove its worth.

Since Title I was first implemented, Congress has enacted additional statutes designed to help States and communities alleviate many of their specific social problems with the assistance of institutions of higher education. Such laws as the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act, the Inter-Governmental Personnel Act, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act (Model Cities) and the "Safe Streets" Act all have

objectives which clearly overlap those of Title I, because the range of Title I activities was purposely made broad.

The frequency with which Congress is passing such categorical programs leads to speculation about what it is Title I has left to do. Certainly, Title I priorities and activities must be reconsidered in light of what other massive Federal programs are designed to accomplish.

It is our belief that Title I should increasingly provide the means through which effective coordination can be achieved among all urban programs having a community service and higher continuing education component. At the present time, these programs exist and operate independently of each other. They may serve a common purpose or a common clientele, and yet there is no instrumentality within the Federal government or at State level to orchestrate their independent activities. If Title I activities at both national and State levels, and within colleges and universities, could be redirected toward serving such a coordinating role, the effectiveness of a wide range of extension, continuing education and community service programs would be enhanced.

We propose that planning for specific steps necessary to accomplish this purpose should begin in the Office of Education in consultation with other agencies concerned. To the extent it feels competent to do so, this Council will willingly assist and enthusiastically support such an effort.

In these times of dynamic change, knowledge and skill are more important than ever before for both individual success and societal achievement. Traditional approaches are no longer adequate to deal with the educational needs of a society characterized by changing occupational structures, increased leisure time and shifting social values.

In the effort to alleviate pressing community problems, the Title I program views the total community as the classroom and knowledge as a process of inquiry and action on the part of adult citizens. In this context, the Title I program through hundreds of specially designed educational projects concentrates on recognized community concerns and the people who can influence the necessary changes.

In Fiscal Year 1972, of the 478 "completed" projects, 310 (64.8%) were programs of direct instruction—innovative courses, skill workshops and policy-related conferences. Men and women in all age categories and with varied educational backgrounds came together to learn together in the interest of their communities. To make continuing educational opportunities more relevant to the needs of individuals and communities, colleges and universities provide specially designed instructional programs for those adults who have the greatest need. Attached as Appendix B is the 1971 Annual Report of the Community Service and Continuing Education Program of the Office of Education. It is replete with examples and illustrates the thrust of this program. (See page 97.) □



8M17

## APPENDIX A

# PART I

## A QUESTION OF STEWARDSHIP:

**A Study of The Federal Role in Higher Continuing Education**

# INTRODUCTION

Section 109 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 provides that The National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education

> *. . .shall review the administration and effectiveness of all Federally supported extension and continuing education programs, including community service programs, make recommendations with respect thereto, and make annual reports. . . of its findings and recommendations to the Secretary [of Health, Education and Welfare] and to the President.*

This study constitutes the annual review required of the Council: an examination of the Federal involvement in extension, continuing education and community service programs.

This Federal involvement is massive, unorganized and multi-purposed.* It has grown rapidly over the past decade without having been given a conscious sense of direction. It is the result of many different laws, administered in different ways by many different departments and agencies of the Federal government. Yet there are some common strands which help explain what exists and which help reveal both strengths and deficiencies.

## *PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED*

One such strand is the pronounced legislative concern with disadvantaged elements in our society. In a deliberate effort to promote social mobility, Congress has enacted a broad band of extension and continuing education programs addressed to those less able to compete for economic standing and educational attainment. This legislative emphasis has been reinforced by Federal administrative policy and paralleled by changes in practice and policy on the part of many institutions of higher education.

## *HEALTH AND EDUCATION PROFESSIONALS*

Another major strand results from Federal concern with public education and public health. Forty percent of the programs included in this study provide funds for the continuing education of teachers and persons in the field of medicine and public health. In seeking to improve the quality of education and health care, the Federal government has created numerous programs designed to advance the professional competence of persons employed in teaching and medicine.

*See Tables 1 and 2

**Table 1. Program Purpose**

| Program Addressed to: | No. of Programs | Federal Expenditures |
|---|---|---|
| Educational Personnel Development | 36 | $ 281,113,000 |
| Public Health (Personnel Development and Community Services) | 22 | 330,136,000 |
| Vocational Education | 8 | 48,848,000 |
| Miscellaneous Education for the General Public | 9 | 12,168,000 |
| Veterans Education | 3 | 1,032,753,000 |
| Agricultural Production and Rural Life | 13 | 134,543,000 |
| Community Problems: | | |
| (a) Environmental Problems | 15 | 52,530,000 |
| (b) Problems of the Disadvantaged | 10 | 1,517,846,000 |
| (c) Crime and Delinquency | 9 | 248,487,000 |
| (d) Multi-Purpose | 18 | 433,173,000 |
| TOTALS | 143 | $4,091,597,000 |

**Table 2. Elements in Public Directly Served**

| Program Clientele | No. of Programs | Total |
|---|---|---|
| Education Professionals | 31 | $ 211,478,000 |
| Health Professionals | 23 | 252,932,000 |
| The Disadvantaged | 23 | 1,985,110,000 |
| Professionals in various fields (social welfare, environmental science public employees, etc.) | 22 | 308,249,000 |
| State and Local Governments | 16 | 165,041,000 |
| Colleges and Universities* | 14 | 45,323,000 |
| Veterans | 3 | 1,032,753,000 |
| Miscellaneous Categories | 11 | 90,711,000 |
| TOTALS | 143 | $4,091,597,000 |

*For this purpose, colleges and universities are considered as a clientele grouping when they are the direct recipients of Federal funds and *the main thrust* of the program (in the opinion of the administering Federal agency) is designed to benefit them.

*COMMUNITY SERVICE*

Still a third major strand of effort results from growing Federal awareness that communities beset with complex social problems require support and assistance in developing appropriate solutions. Increasingly, the resources of colleges and universities are brought to bear on the amelioration of local and regional problems ranging from environmental degradation to the reduction of crime and delinquency. This growing community service function is one of the most significant developments in higher education and in local government.

*COOPERATIVE EXTENSION*

While emphasis on the disadvantaged, on continuing education for teachers and medical personnel and on the community service role of higher education is of relatively recent origin, a solid block of programs included in this study has a long and remarkable history. Agricultural extension was an American innovation which today has been transplanted to many developing countries. Under the title of Cooperative Extension, a unique partnership among counties, States, the Federal government and the land grant colleges and universities has been developed and today continues to serve important and expanding purposes. Unlike most of the newer extension and continuing education programs, cooperative extension was a part of a well-conceived strategy for transforming agriculture through the application of science and knowledge to farming and to the problems of rural life.

Finally, much program effort centers around educational opportunities for veterans. The "G.I. Bill" continues to be a major factor in enabling veterans to continue their education after military service. Although the veteran may be enrolled in the same curriculum and under the same requirements as any other "regular" student, he does so under a unique entitlement which makes available to him a wide choice of opportunities for reentering the educational process.

Among the continuing education programs examined in this study, none has as its primary focus a concentration on broad public issues and a clientele of persons who are most influential in shaping or resolving these issues. In short, there is a lack of effort to improve our society by improving its leadership. Scattered efforts to develop "educational leaders" or to improve the understanding of local government officials about environmental degradation, crime or management do exist, and some of the Federal government's own training activities do reach top-level administrators through programs addressed toward national issues and priorities. But these efforts do not attack the central problem directly nor on the broad scale required.

Never has so much been known about man and his world and the worlds about him. At the same time, we lack the structure which enables a broad span of local and national leaders and the people themselves to consider the impact of masses of information in ways which bring knowledge to bear on the problems of our time. The essential links between the development of knowledge and its comprehension and practical use by those who chart and influence the direction of our society are largely missing. Formation of these links is a basic task of continuing education and its most crucial responsibility.

The Federal government has fostered deep involvement by colleges and universities in continuing education and in a wide variety of services to communities. This study is an attempt to describe the characteristics and dimensions of this multi-billion dollar involvement and to assess some of its implications and results.

*Essentially, our study embraces those Federally funded programs which provide higher education, usually on a part-time basis, for adults; or which through research application, instructional activities and technical assistance use the resources of higher education in support of community efforts to mitigate societal problems. Included are those Federal programs which support higher educational opportunities for adults who are returning for full-time study after a substantial break in the normal educational process. We will refer to all such activities as programs of higher continuing education.*

The vast range of training and professional education activity conducted in government institutions or by government agencies for military personnel and civilian employees is not included in this study.* Similarly, various government-operated continuing education programs directly serving the public have primarily a background importance in providing a more complete picture of Federal activity. By selecting as a primary focus those programs operated in, by or through colleges and universities, we have excluded detailed treatment of much important Federal activity. But concurrently this has enabled us to give sharper attention to our central concern with higher continuing education.

In obtaining relevant data and in seeking to draw meaning from it we have contacted hundreds of Federal administrators in Washington and in regional offices. Their knowledge, insight and willing cooperation have been of cardinal importance. Through field visits to campuses, communities and State offices we have had some opportunity to obtain perspectives from State and local government officials and from university administrators and key faculty about the Federal programs included in our study. Officials of many educational associations have been helpful in providing information and guidance which we freely used in identifying problems and selecting programs for more intensive scrutiny. Our attempt throughout was to gather facts, impressions and points of view which we could subject internally to analytical scrutiny and arrive at findings which reflect our objective judgments.

Secondary sources were consulted primarily for background reference, since there was no currently valid study of the precise mix of programs which matched our study definitions. The most pertinent source was a 1966 survey conducted by Greenleigh Associates on behalf of this Council. That survey identified some 115 Federally funded university-level programs of extension, continuing education and community service. By 1971, this information was largely dated and from its inception was intended primarily to identify and describe Federal activity in other than analytical terms. The well-known and massive survey conducted by Dr. Charles Quattlebaum of the Library of Congress *(Federal Education Policies And Proposals)* deals heavily with identification of Federal training of Government employees, and only incidentally with the kinds of programs with which this Council is concerned.

For purposes of identifying current Federal activities, neither the Greenleigh nor Quattlebaum surveys offered a sound beginning point for inquiry. As a result, we began with the Federal government's budgetary documents and the *Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance* issued by the Office of Management and Budget. This latter publication was of particular value and proved to be an accurate and exhaustive base from which to identify programs, agencies and persons.

In terms of background data on higher education and adult education, we reviewed pertinent literature identified from an excellent bibliography obtained from the ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) Clearing House on Adult Education at Syracuse University. Particularly useful were Alexander Liveright's 1965 *Study of Adult Education*; Frank Newman's *Report On Higher Education*; the report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Less Time, More Options*; Alice Rivlin's *The Role Of The Federal Government In Financing Higher Education*; the 1970 *Handbook of Adult Education*; and scores of Government reports and publications.

During the course of this study, we have identified 143 discrete Federal programs which in whole or in part involve the resources of higher education in extension, community service and continuing education.* These programs deal with a wide variety of issues: crime, environmental protection, employment, urban affairs, drug abuse and numerous others. Typically, each of these programs operates in relative isolation from the others, insulated by its own legislative charter, its own funds and its own staff whose career rewards are tied to the survival and expansion of their particular program. There is no Federal policy statement to give coherence and unity to these programs and no single agency of government responsible for giving leadership to Federal-university relationships. Instead, there are many programs, many laws and many agencies which draw upon the resources of higher education.

## *GRANT SEEKING*

In many Federally supported programs there is no clear-cut route through which a university seeking Federal support for a continuing education effort can come into direct contact with the persons who can provide that support. On the one hand we have Federal administrators with funds and on the other university people seeking support for new projects or program efforts; if they come into successful contact with each other, it is often through a process of mutual groping and much floundering.

There is great need for the creation of a central information source which can channel university proposals and requests for funds to the agency and the person who can best act on these requests and proposals. No such

*However, information obtained shows that much effective and little publicized activity is carried on by the Defense Department, the Civil Service Commission, and the training offices of major agencies.

*See Table 3.

**Table 3. Programs with Extension, Continuing Education and Community Services Features**

| Administering Agency | No. of Programs | Federal Expenditures |
|---|---|---|
| Department of Health, Education & Welfare | 70 | $1,991,077,000 |
| National Science Foundation | 12 | 48,804,000 |
| Department of Agriculture | 10 | 131,341,000 |
| Environmental Protection Agency | 8 | 31,614,000 |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 7 | 2,015,000 |
| Department of Housing and Urban Development | 6 | 371,000,000 |
| Department of Justice | 6 | 238,487,000 |
| Office of Economic Opportunity | 6 | 113,752,000 |
| Department of Interior | 4 | 10,648,000 |
| Veterans Administration | 3 | 1,032,753,000 |
| National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities | 3 | 3,357,000 |
| Department of Commerce | 2 | 8,974,000 |
| Department of Labor | 2 | 105,000,000 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 2 | 987,000 |
| Department of Transportation | 1 | 19,000 |
| Department of Defense* | 1 | 1,769,000 |
| TOTALS | 143 | $4,091,597,000 |

*Department of Defense programs for military personnel and civilian employees are not included. The one program shown here is a Civil Defense program for the public.

"switchboard" organization which can put fund seekers in touch with the appropriate fund grantors now exists.

*LACK OF CENTRAL GUIDANCE*

No single agency of the Federal government today has central responsibility for the interaction between the Federal government and institutions of higher education, yet all major departments and agencies have a continuing relationship with colleges and universities. As a result, at any given time several agencies may be engaged in important forms of collaboration with the same educational institutions. While these agencies are pursuing their own legitimate program purposes they often remain oblivious to the programs and objectives of other agencies which routinely interact with these institutions. This makes for a haphazard and sometimes inchoate partnership between universities and the Federal government.

It is not uncommon for different agencies (or even different parts of the same agency) to pursue common objectives through the same institution without being aware that this is occurring. In such instances, the university (in effect) assumes the task of coordinating the activities of the Federal government.

*UNIVERSITY-FEDERAL RELATIONSHIPS*

Constant interaction with universities is an important element in the functional responsibility of many agencies. Much of this interaction is closely tied to the mission of an agency; consequently, responsibility for dealing with colleges and universities cannot be conveniently assigned to some central agency of government. What is required is not a monolithic Federal presence on the university campus but a coordinated one. Today there is no "Federal" presence, merely the presence of Federal agencies acting independently of each other.

All signs indicate that university-Federal agency interaction will continue to increase. Although this interaction has produced abrasions and mutual frustration, it has also proved mutually advantageous. Universities need Federal funds and the opportunity for scholarly involvement in Federal programs relevant to institutional purposes. In turn, colleges and universities are an invaluable resource in support of objectives sought by Federal agencies.

This mutual inter-dependence sometimes gives rise to fear of Federal control or to the possibilities that involvement with Federal programs will warp and damage the university's purposes and strengths. Concurrently, many Federal administrators are critical of university performance and contend that universities are essentially inefficient: their faculties and facilities are under-utilized and they are reluctant to meet deadlines or to complete agreed-upon tasks. There are legitimate grievances on both sides, but there is no forum through which these grievances can be aired and through which better solutions can be devised.

*UNIVERSITY ROLES AND FUNCTIONS*

We are now in a period during which social purposes and priorities are being questioned and rearranged; the social relevance and importance of knowledge are also being subjected to scrutiny and change. This interaction between knowledge and society is an ancient phenomenon, but it becomes of cardinal importance today when accelerated social change and rapid discovery of knowledge interact with each other.

Universities develop and transmit knowledge; but intrinsically, they have always served multiple purposes and the historical development of American higher education shows this clearly.

As with other major institutions in our society, the university reflects an elaborate mixture of European traditions and American values. Dr. Nathan Cohen, in an article entitled "The University and The Urban Condition," suggests that the American university is the product of four major strands. During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the original university pattern was created in Italy and transmitted to other parts of Europe. The first universities were designed to train theologians, doctors, lawyers and–increasingly–students of philosophy who would serve society outside these three professions. Quality education for a select group of undergraduates was stressed by the second strand, which is part of the early British tradition. The university was to be concerned with education and not with professional training. In liberal education the choice of subject was less important than the way in which one pursued it. The goal of education was the development of intellectual powers, a disciplining of the mind and character. The German tradition emphasized research, specialized graduate training and the advancement of knowledge. Rather than the transmission of knowledge and culture, the German university was more concerned with the development of new knowledge. These three European influences combined with a fourth strand which was uniquely American–the values of populist democracy. The Morrill Act of 1862 gave birth to the land grant colleges and universities, and democratized the opportunities for higher education. Class and economics status began to yield to interest and capacity as the major criteria for admittance to the university. This strand therefore represented a conscious effort to make the university more directly responsive to the needs of a society holding egalitarian values.

The complexity of this pattern of values, aims and functions has enabled the university simultaneously to play many and sometimes contradictory roles. It produces sophisticated research, offers remedial education, trains students for a multitude of social and professional positions and, to some extent, offers an alternative life style to that which characterizes American society. Pleas from many quarters calling for the university to return to its original tradition are beside the point, because there has never been one controlling tradition in American higher education. The purposes of American higher education have always changed with the changing needs and values of our society, and even among different universities the degree and direction of change have varied greatly.

Another way of describing the particular nature of the American university is to say that there has never been a clear resolution of the question of the university's relationship to the larger society. A series of anomalies express the contradictory and incongruous effects the university has had on our society. By providing low-cost public education, the university has been a vehicle for upward mobility at the same time that its emphasis on merit and lengthy training has led to the reign of the "expert." University-based research and university faculty provide much of the intellectual basis which undergirds our national policy, but the university also serves as a sanctuary for many of the government's most vocal and radical critics. As they expand, urban universities displace local residents and disrupt community patterns, while their faculties develop programs to analyze and ease urban tensions.

## *OPEN UNIVERSITIES*

Of particular significance to continuing higher education and to a changing social role for universities are movements toward External Degrees and the Open University. The Open University is a term encompassing a variety of educational experiments which attempt to relate education closely to the student's experience. The educational emphases range from communal living arrangements which stress learning through group living and involvement in the community, to sub-colleges of larger universities which have developed rather formal and elaborate methods of accrediting "non-formal learning." This concept originated in the United Kingdom. In this country it has taken a particularly American form. Its purpose is to attract students who reject the close relationship between university education and preparation for a vocational role in the larger society. Rather than valuing a college education as a means to a vocational end, the Open University's interest is in the educational process itself and the development of human talent.

A major issue facing Open University is survival. As with the development of many new and experimental institutions, there has been a pattern of heady excitement, followed by disillusionment and disintegration. A somewhat larger issue is the relevance of such institutions to American society as a whole. Open Universities so far have had little to offer to the middle or lower middle class who view and value education as a means to upward mobility. Whether the kinds of experiments and values represented by the Open University movement have relevance to more than a minority of college students who seem to prefer not to meet the demands of traditional educational processes is still an unresolved question.

## *EXTERNAL DEGREES*

External Degree programs contrast sharply with those offered by Open Universities in several important ways. While the rationale of Open Universities is that the process of learning is more important than the accumulation of credits, External Degree programs are an attempt to find imaginative ways of accrediting learning which has already occurred. They develop ways of validating non-traditional forms of educational activity such as job experience,

independent study or community service. Upon this base they provide (through both traditional and non-traditional learning experiences) a body of additional knowledge patterned to meet the requirements of traditional degree programs.

Most External Degree programs involve one or more of the following models: (1) taking instruction to the student where he is or must be because of his work or family commitments; (2) arranging to give transfer credit on a less stringent basis than in the past; and (3) arranging to give credit by examination of learning acquired independently or in unconventional programs.

While the Open University movement is revolutionary in the sense that it negates one of the historically most important functions of the university—the channeling of students into roles in the larger society—External Degree programs are a modern version of one of the four major strands in American higher education. They offer opportunities for upward mobility to those who cannot otherwise attend college. By broadening the base of the kinds of learning which can be accredited, they provide access to careers which would otherwise be unattainable.

These two programs illustrate the versatility and adaptability of the American university in meeting very different social needs. Numerous other challenges and unresolved questions remain. At the same time that demands for services from the university are increasing, an unparalleled financial crisis exists in higher education. Small colleges, which traditionally have offered diversity in terms of educational programming, are in the most acute financial straits, but State universities have also had to curtail activities as a result of reductions in funds or escalating expenses. Finding appropriate ways of assisting universities financially will be a major challenge to the Federal government, and Federal support for higher continuing education is an important part of this challenge.

## *LENGTHENED EDUCATION vs. CONTINUING EDUCATION*

Finally, it is apparent that two contrasting forces are at work in higher education. In one direction, more students are remaining in school for longer periods. By lengthening the educational process, we apparently seek to cram into the early years of life sufficient information and knowledge to last a lifetime. Concurrently, we recognize that regardless of the length of an initial educational exposure, the knowledge gained is subject to rapid obsolescence as new technologies and new knowledge are spawned. The successful resolution of this tension between the trend toward an extended period of education and the need for continuing education will depend on our ability, as a society, to provide the opportunities and the means for persons to continue their education at various stages of life. The knowledge an engineer needs at age forty is not the same he needed at age twenty-five, and indeed this knowledge might not have existed fifteen years ago.

Yet as a society, we have basically failed to provide the same opportunities for continuing education as we provide for an initial, extended education. Colleges and universities have traditionally provided such opportunities only on a self-supporting basis. While subsidizing the on-campus student very greatly, the part-time student has very often been required to bear the full costs or nearly so. The mature individual with heavy financial responsibility needs to maintain his income; he cannot simply stop working to obtain educational refreshment for a prolonged period. Some employers, including the Federal government, do provide salary support and funds for educational expenses when an individual pursues career-related study for a full academic year or longer. But for most persons, higher continuing education for concentrated, long periods is ruled out by the obstacle of economics.

## *QUALITY AND OPPORTUNITY*

Instead, principal reliance has been on the short-term or after-hours educational program which does not unduly interfere with work requirements. Even so, continuing education opportunities have largely been available to those who can best afford them, while the needs of those who most may require such opportunities have often had to be ignored. Often these evening courses do not proportionately attract the best faculty nor take into account the maturity and subject-matter-related knowledge of the students. Sometimes the courses are merely carbon copies of those taught to regular, full-time students, when the needs of mature students may be very different. Effective guidance and counselling needed to point the student toward the curriculum which will best serve his needs is often lacking.

Fortunately, many institutions and many educators recognize these problems, and active efforts are being made to upgrade the quality of part-time, continuing education. Even in the face of serious financial stringencies, or perhaps because of them, we have found repeated evidence that the quality of continuing education is being strengthened and that increasingly universities without a tradition of large-scale involvement in continuing education are giving new emphases to enlarging and improving their commitment. Some of the intellectual snobbery which relegated "evening division" courses to second-rate status is dying and many "traditionalist" educators have found an excitement and challenge in teaching after-hours courses in which the knowledge and motivation of their students surpass that of their full-time students. Further improvements in faculty, in course design and in better use of non-traditional approaches to learning are necessary to give continuing education the degree of excellence its tasks require.

Against this background, and within this context, operate the various Federally funded programs of higher continuing education. These programs are vitally important within the whole range of tasks and problems confronting the university, and in turn are affected by them. While these programs do not touch all of higher education, all of the strengths and limitations of higher education play strongly upon them. □

# SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

Findings of varying importance which emerge from this study are interspersed throughout the text. Some of the more basic ones are summarized below. They identify, in schematic fashion, many of the basic characteristics and shortcomings of Federally supported programs of extension, continuing education and community service.

*PROGRAM LEGISLATION*

The initiative for establishing most of the programs reviewed in this study came from Congress and from public interest groups. Relatively little successful initiative came from the administrative levels at which these programs are operated and monitored.

- Congress has shown a pronounced tendency to legislate and fund new programs as discrete entities. This has led to creation of many programs with similar or related purposes, administered by different departments and agencies. Such a multiplication of programs which are spread across many agencies makes coordination, planning and effective use of university resources more difficult.
- Much of the existing legislation has a set life span of five years or less. While there are valid reasons for this, long-range planning, effective administration and achievement of long-term goals are hampered within the government and within the university because of uncertainty about the continued existence of these programs.
- In enacting programs of extension, continuing education and community services, Congress has often sought to serve important social purposes by deliberately involving higher education in social problems such as poverty, crime, drug abuse, unemployment, and environmental degradation. Such involvement is fundamentally changing traditional concepts of the university's self-image and its role in society.

*PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION*

There is no common policy governing use of university resources by the Federal agencies, no central agency with primary responsibility for relating to higher education, and few coordinating mechanisms designed to assure that the many programs of the Federal government constitute a coherent whole. Under such conditions, duplication of effort and contradiction of purpose are difficult to avoid, and effective coordination becomes an impossibility.

- The Office of Education is not internally organized to give concerted attention and a precise focus to its concern with higher continuing education. The growing importance of this field seems to justify an organizational structure responsive to it.
- Efforts by the Office of Management and Budget to coordinate Federal programs have centered on fiscal concerns. Program substance, purpose and administration have received little attention. When program reviews are made, they are typically of the "quick and dirty" variety, because OMB does not have the staff resources required for thorough reviews.
- Relatively few examples of effective efforts to evaluate program activities were encountered. Most often, agency administrators candidly reported that evaluations were non-existent, were *pro forma* statements prepared to fulfill legal or administrative requirements and therefore had little value as guides to planning and decision making, or were self-serving declarations. Since improvement in program performance depends on objective assessments of program strengths and weaknesses, the widespread lack of effective evaluation is a factor of crucial significance.
- A plethora of fund-matching ratios, overhead-cost formulas, grant approval procedures and reporting requirements exists. This complicates and exacerbates university-Federal agency interaction, and diverts time, effort and attention from program purposes and objectives.

*PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS*

Broadly stated, there are two major categories of programs for which this Council has oversight: (1) programs which fund courses of post-secondary level instruction for adults continuing their education, and (2) programs which

link educational resources to specific local or national needs and in which institutions of higher education (including community colleges) provide communities with research findings, technical assistance, demonstration projects and advisory services.

- Programs of the first category—educational services for adults—concentrate heavily on continuing education for persons in the health fields, teachers and school administrators, and social welfare workers. In addition, the "G.I.Bill" remains the single largest program, in both fiscal and human terms, under which persons can continue an interrupted education on either a full- or part-time basis.
- Programs of the second category—those which apply and transfer knowledge by means other than classroom instruction or independent study—essentially concentrate on the whole gamut of social problems present in our community life. These programs involve universities in such activities as providing legal services to the poor, advice on public school desegregration and environmental research.
- With some exceptions, such as agricultural extension efforts, most programs of extension, continuing education and community services are of recent origin and mirror the heightened Federal support for both higher education and social programs.

## *INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION*

In the final analysis, the success or failure of Federally supported programs of extension, continuing education and community service depends on quality of performance by colleges and universities. For the most part, higher continuing education still commands a low institutional priority and most institutions are not internally organized in ways which can bring their unified resources to bear on community problems.

Even in large public universities which avow their purposes to be teaching, research and extension services (or, more recently, continuing education), the reward system and opportunities for faculty career advancement are conditioned very largely—and in some cases almost exclusively—on evaluation of services in teaching and research.

The academic reward system is archaic in the face of the realities of societal demands as reflected in the 143 programs studied here. Colleges and universities need to reexamine with candor the myth that excellence in community services and continuing education is assured by excellence in teaching full-time on-campus students and excellence in research. If the Federal government expects excellence in the programs which involve community service and continuing education resources of higher education, it should with equal candor assess what it has done to assure the capacity of higher education to respond with excellence.

- Despite these handicaps, higher education in general shows an increased willingness to depart from tradition and to undertake new forms of community service activity. External Degree programs, the Open University and growing involvement in community affairs all testify to the pace of change and the departure from tradition.
- In providing educational services to adults, colleges and universities have experienced shortages in qualified adult educators and counsellors who can guide adult students. Generally, academic institutions have not as yet used to significant advantage new technologies for reaching students conveniently and inexpensively.
- With the exception of extension personnel in agriculture, colleges and universities have been slow to develop a network of faculty equipped to extend knowledge to those in society who can apply it constructively. The extension network in agriculture came into being as a result of Federal support; similar forms of support will probably be required to enable academic institutions to extend effectively knowledge in other fields. Some steps in this direction under the Sea Grant and RANN programs have been taken, but these have been comparatively modest and specialized efforts.
- Despite increasingly heavy reliance on colleges and universities to assist in the solution of community problems, and despite increasingly heavy fund outlays for this purpose, little has been done directly by the Federal government to strengthen the capacities of institutions to serve Federal program purposes. The Federal government has typically used the existing quality of institutional resources and the existing structures for their delivery. This approach differs markedly from Federal programs of defense and space research which emphasized upgrading of institutional capabilities. □

## A FOCUS ON ISSUES

# COORDINATION: SOME BASIC PROBLEMS IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

A Federal system, by its nature, divides responsibility and disperses broadly the powers of decision and action. When further coupled with the concept of a division of responsibility among independent executive, judicial and legislative branches, the American system of governance gives vitality, protection and expression to democratic ideals; but it creates monumental problems of administration. When our government, at all levels, accepted only minimal involvement in the socio-economic problems of our society, the tasks of administration were relatively uncomplicated. Under conditions existing today, the vastly expanded scope of governmental action has strained our administrative capacity to cope with fresh responsibilities and new challenges.

### *INCREASING COMPLEXITY OF ADMINISTRATION*

As administrators are required to do more, they are subjected to more concerted pressures from political leaders, the courts, the public and their own administrative hierarchies. As government programs increase in volume and scope, the administrators experience greater difficulty in relating their functions to numerous others which impinge on their particular responsibilities. When increasingly the needs of local and State governments require understanding and support from the Federal level, the existing forms of interaction evidence more sharply long-present inadequacies. And the present organization of the Federal executive branch reveals serious shortcomings resulting from the enlarged and changing demands made upon it.

In essence, the problems of coordination among the continuing education programs within the ambit of this study reflect the larger problems of public administration. Their optimal remedies are often dependent on major surgery for the administrative system as a whole, and in a small way they reflect the inadequacies of the entire system.

### *LACK OF COMMON POLICY*

Coordination of these programs is complicated by the legal and organizational dispersion of responsibility. These 143 programs are established by over 100 discrete laws and nearly every major Federal department and agency is responsible for one or more of them. While it is wholly reasonable to administer through each department those higher education programs which are related to that department's mission, this cannot be done effectively without a policy framework applicable to all departments. No such policy structure exists.

### *ROLE OF CENTRAL AGENCIES*

Instead, we encounter a collection of laws which authorize and fund a large number of programs administered in relative isolation from each other by many officials and organizations without a common expression of purpose or a unifying concept of administration. The Office of Education, as currently organized and chartered, does not exercise the kind of government-wide leadership in the area of university-government relations which can insure effective coordination. Even within HEW, the Office of Education has no influence on vast blocks of "education monies" expended by the Health Services and Mental Health Administration and by the Social and Rehabilitation Service. Through the Federal Inter-Agency Committee on Education (FICE), OE has attempted to provide a mechanism for information-sharing and a forum for discussion; but like most inter-agency committees, FICE has no executive authority and no command over resources. As a result, its efforts at coordination, while valuable, fall far short of what is required. And in the final analysis, the major responsibility for finding appropriate solutions cannot be shouldered by the Office of Education alone because the solutions needed lie outside OE's jurisdiction and within the purview of the Office of Management and Budget.



887

OMB is charged with a government-wide coordination role as a staff arm of the President. Yet for reasons basically beyond its control, OMB is responsible for coordinating an executive branch structure which in its current configuration simply defies coordination. With specific regard to the programs included in this study, OMB's efforts have largely centered on improving administrative arrangements and reviewing the fiscal implications of these programs. In another dimension, OMB has made substantial progress in seeking to improve the entire Federal grant-making process. In themselves, these efforts are necessary and important but they merely nibble at the root problems caused by an unwieldly executive branch structure.

## *NEED FOR REORGANIZATION*

Most of these coordination difficulties are due to existing patterns of organization which blur agency responsibility so that similar programs are conducted independently by several agencies. Hence, many departments and agencies pursue pieces of the same set of broad objectives or serve the same clientele. For example, major educational programs which serve the urban poor are operated by OEO, HUD and HEW under their separate legislative charters.

The problem is further complicated because funds are made available to these agencies through a Congressional committee structure which parallels the existing and deficient structure of the executive branch. Appropriations sub-committees are organized and equipped to set fiscal levels and internal priorities for departments and agencies. These sub-committees are not organized or equipped to set funding levels and priorities for common programs and functions regardless of which agency conducts them. Instead of financing broad programs and functions, Congress finances agencies and those bits and pieces of program efforts which each agency contains.

What is required is an executive branch reorganization *which unites structure with function*, along lines of current Administration proposals. Such a reorganization would facilitate a better realignment of Congressional committees, and formation of program priorities by both Congress and the Administration would become more readily possible. Although reorganization would not solve now and forever all problems of internal coordination, inter-governmental relationships or executive-legislative frictions, many problems now existing would not arise and others would be susceptible to better solutions. Without a sweeping reorganization, the prospects for multiplying and exacerbating present coordination difficulties cannot be escaped.

In a major respect, therefore, the future success of programs for which this Council bears advisory responsibilities depends on a thorough and well-conceived executive branch reorganization. This applies equally to present programs and to those which may be created in the future. So long as the functional boundaries among agencies remain murky; as long as responsibilities for action continue to be ill-defined; and until clear policy concepts state the goals and purposes for applying the resources of higher education toward service to communities and the nation, Federal support for extension, continuing education and community services will operate under heavy handicaps. States, communities and institutions of higher education will all continue to feel the effects of these handicaps. Accomplishments will be weakened and prospects for achieving the intended results will be impaired. □

# THE LEGISLATIVE BASE

A review of the statutes which brought into being the various programs included in this study supports a few generalizations about the Federal role in extension and continuing education.

*PROBLEM ORIENTATION*

Most of the programs studied were created in the recent past; typically they represent a response to a major social problem or national challenge. Sputnik stimulated great legislative activity in higher education. Anti-poverty legislation has relied heavily upon education as the vehicle for economic betterment and social mobility. Legislative efforts to deal with environmental degradation, crime, drug abuse and alcoholism all include educational components. Racial tensions, urban decay and unemployment produced legislative activity affecting higher continuing education. In one essential respect, therefore, there is a thread of unity among these many disparate statutes: they are problem-centered. The need to "make education relevant" has been the touchstone of legislative activity for continuing education.

*LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE*

The initiative for most of this legislation came from Congress and from a few educational interest groups able to obtain Congressional attention and support. White House initiative has also been important, but little successful legislation has worked its way up through the lower rungs of the bureaucracy. The administrators who are eventually responsible for operating major educational programs rarely helped conceive or shape these programs, and in some cases administrators who testified against a proposed piece of legislation were ultimately responsible for carrying it out.

*TEMPORARY LEGISLATION*

Many of the programs studied are temporary: they were established through legislation which has a pre-set expiration date. This makes their continued existence subject to uncertainty from their very beginning and impairs the ability of the administering agency to establish a stable and effective administrative base. Similarly, this creates problems for the educational institutions, which in effect are repeatedly required to redirect their own plans, resources and activities in response to transitory Federal programs.

*RESEARCH AND EXTENSION*

In the rewards system of universities, there is a high premium on research, on pushing back the frontiers of knowledge. Professional reputations are made through research and the publication of research findings. Academic rank and tenure are closely related to success in research and publication. Conversely, there are fewer rewards for those who transmit knowledge, yet this function of transmitting knowledge—of extending it within a profession or to the community at large—is the crucial link between research and the ability to derive value from it.

With rare exceptions, legislative emphasis also has been placed on the heady tasks of research, rather than on the equally important job of extension. This emphasis, in combination with the primacy accorded research within the university, has created substantial gaps between the development of knowledge and its constructive use and application in society.

*EDUCATIONAL LOBBIES*

Legislation does not just happen; it occurs in response to felt needs and often as a result of the energetic efforts of individuals and groups who lobby for it. To say that a

powerful education lobby exists implies monolithic connotations which do not square with reality. Instead there are many education lobbies which have competing interests and competitive demands on Federal funds. It is rare indeed to find consensus among educational associations on specific legislative items or even general agreement on priorities. Yet the influence of education lobbies on legislation is apparent, and for the most part it is an influence stemming from broad public support, from the support of educational leaders whose views deserve respect, or from the production of convincing staff work.

Within the groups and associations comprising the "education lobby," few have as a primary interest programs of extension and higher continuing education. Within the university structure itself, with rare exceptions, the extension and continuing education functions are allotted a generally low priority. The "traditional" activities of the university are still given preference in allocation of funds, faculty and facilities.

Consequently, it would appear that the recent expansion in programs of extension, continuing education and community services do not result primarily from lobbying activities or pressures from university heads. Rather they appear to result from an awareness by the political leadership that higher education can and should take active part in helping to solve the problems of our times.

*NEW PRIORITIES*

The Federal government has used universities to conduct defense-related research and to solve the research and engineering problems of space exploration. As national priorities turn towards the problems of the environment, crime, health, urban affairs and poverty, colleges and universities are again being used to help support national efforts at finding solutions. With this shift in priorities, the public service orientation of university schools of extension and continuing education and the community colleges comes into more effective demand. They have the experience and the mission of providing direct services to people and communities. And they have the skills and the responsibilities for reaching, through programs of continuing education and extension, the persons ***responsible now*** for decision and action on the problems of our society.

The legislative trends in this direction still seem less the result of conscious choices than of movement prompted by events and shaped by intelligent intuition. However, the trends are pronounced and evident in the steady (if unsystematic) growth of community services programs. In a major way, these new uses of university resources have already given the extension and continuing education arms of higher education unprecedented opportunities for public service – and the full potential has barely been tapped. □

# THE ADMINISTRATION OF EDUCATIONAL GRANT PROGRAMS: A NEW FEUDALISM

There are approximately 1100 discrete Federal grant programs. This total is administered by sixty-one different Federal departments, independent agencies, commissions and councils. In the course of our review of these programs, 143 have been identified as relevant to the statutory charge to this Council to review the "administration and effectiveness of all Federally supported extension and continuing education programs, including community services."

The number of different administrative concepts, policies and practices which affect the administration of these programs is staggering. Some of these policies and practices have evolved over a number of years and have the advantages of experience behind them. They work. Many others have a life span which is short, either because they recently replaced practices proved ineffective or because they were developed in conjunction with new programs. Others seem to continue through sheer inertia or because they have origins and official sanctions which defy attempts at reform.

What follows is a tabulation of administrative policies, problems and practices which have been identified in the course of our review of extension, continuing education, and community service programs. It is difficult, perhaps impossible, to provide this tabulation with any acceptable order and sequence. Where items relate to each other, they appear together. Other items seem to have an independence of their own and may not, consequently, be directly related to either what precedes or follows.

*APPLICATION PROCEDURES*

One of the first difficulties a prospective grantee confronts is the question of application procedures.* The Federal Government has a standard application form for prospective Government employees; it does not have a standard application form for prospective grantees for continuing education programs. There are a great number of Federal guidelines, requirements, policies and definitions that must be adhered to by individuals and institutions seeking funds. As a consequence, grant applicants, particularly colleges and universities, may be required to file

*See Table 4.

**Table 4. Grant Application Procedure**

| | No. of Programs |
|---|---|
| Academic Institutions to Agency Headquarters | 73 |
| Individuals to Agency Headquarters | 17 |
| States to Agency Headquarters | 15 |
| Academic Institutions to the State | 15 |
| Academic Institutions to the Agency Regional Office | 9 |
| Communities to the State or Federal Government | 8 |
| States to the Agency Regional Office | 3 |
| Academic Institutions and Individuals to the Federal Government | 3 |
| TOTAL | 143 |

**Review Processes for Approval of Grants**

| | No. of Programs |
|---|---|
| No review | 15 |
| Internal review | 47 |
| Outside experts review | 7 |
| Staff and outside experts review | 71 |
| Staff and other Federal agency staff review | 3 |
| TOTAL | 143 |

twenty applications to twenty agencies on twenty separate forms, most of which require identical information. This process is often repeated annually or more frequently.

In some instances, the formal application process is supplemented by the use of pre-proposals. These pre-proposals are brief statements of intent submitted by potential grantees to determine whether or not a formal application is eligible for consideration. An increasing number of agencies and programs, like the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities and such Office of Education programs as the Teacher Corps, are using this time-saving technique. This system is particularly helpful to developing institutions which have not had the experience of grantsmanship and, because of that, are unable to compete effectively for program funding.

Several agencies like HEW and the Environmental Protection Agency have adopted standard application forms developed and used by the National Institutes of Health. In effect, this constitutes a kind of consolidation and is a working model of efforts to standardize and simplify the grant-making process.

*GRANT REVIEW PROCEDURES*

Just as there is an innumerable variety of application procedures, so also is there a variety of review procedures through which these applications must be channelled.* Eighty-six percent of the programs reviewed require some kind of internal review by staff or review by staff with the help of consultants. There are many agencies that allow major decisions regarding application approval to be made at the local level, others at the regional level. There are instances when applications are reviewed substantively at both these levels–only to be reviewed again at the national level. It is not uncommon to find, for example, an Associate Commissioner of Education getting routinely involved in this review process, as is frequently the case in the Office of Education's Bureau of Education Personnel Development. Some agencies, like the Social and Rehabilitation Service, and some programs, like the Office of Education's Civil Rights Technical Assistance and Training Program, have given the agencies' regional officers full authority to make final decisions on applications.

Non-government consultants are systematically used by all Federal agencies to assist in measuring the merits of individual applications. The use of these consultants has proved to be an effective shield against Congressional inquiries into the quality and priorities of certain programs. At the same time, these consulting services are transitory and both bring and quickly lose the knowledge and competence relevant to the particular program.

*PROGRAM FUNDING*

Once applications have been reviewed and approved, there is the next question of the actual funding of the program or project. The Federal funding process operates on an annual basis, beginning each fiscal year on July 1 and ending the following June 30. Budgeting and planning complications arise among institutions which operate on an academic-year basis or on a calendar-year basis. Regardless of whichever twelve-month period is being used, heavy reliance on short-term funding arrangements encourages emphasis on short-term objectives and, consequently, on short-term achievements. Within this cycle, long-term objectives and goals are hampered, discouraged and sometimes wholly obviated.

In over 50% of the programs reviewed, academic institutions were the primary recipient of Federal funds. In only three programs are Federal funds distributed to these institutions on a multi-year, formula grant basis. When emphasis is put on annual funding rather than multi-year funding, the extent to which institutions of higher learning can make a commitment to a Federal program is diminished, particularly when they can not be assured that Federal funds will extend for the length of their commitment.

*REPORTING REQUIREMENTS*

Given this heavy emphasis on annual funding, it is not surprising that there exists an equally heavy emphasis on annual reporting. Virtually every Federal grant requires the submission of an annual fiscal report. Many grants also require substantial narrative reports as well, in addition to terminal reports. It is generally conceded that it is impossible to give each of these reports thorough and thoughtful consideration. The Federal government simply does not have the manpower assigned for this purpose. The crisis of this situation is most obvious in those programs which are appropriated increased funds for programming but no additional funds for salaries and expenses. The program expands, the projects increase, and reports flow in with greater frequency to a staff that remains the same in size.

The anomaly in the situation is this: the submission of annual reports by grantees is the most routine expression of the actual performance by a grantee, and it is upon this reporting system that agencies often satisfy themselves that a project is worth continuing from year to year. There are other ways an agency might do this. Outside evaluation is one way, but outside evaluation of programs and projects has long been inadequate within the Federal government. Site visits by staff and others is another way. This way, too, has been generally inadequate, not because of staff competence but because of the limitations placed upon staff size and time.

*MATCHING REQUIREMENTS*

No one has ever estimated the number of matching formulas that have been devised by the government, nor

*See Table 4.

has there ever been put forward a comprehensive rationale for their existence. In our list of programs, fifty-five require some kind of matching of the Federal contribution by the grant recipient.* These may vary from a voluntary or five percent match, or, as in the case with the Cooperative Extension Service programs, a 100% match. Even though the Federal dollar may be available, and the objectives of the programs to which they are directed highly beneficial, the matching process may unwittingly compel State and local governments to commit sorely needed funds to areas for which they were not originally intended. There is a further question as to how appropriate matching requirements are when a project involves a developing institution or a grantee that is dealing with underprivileged socio-economic groups. There are many instances of otherwise deserving applications which are denied funding simply because of their inability to provide the matching dollars. Further, when matching funds are to be provided through fees collected from enrolled program participants, the problem of the pressure to provide programs only for those who can afford them (as opposed to those who may need them most and can least afford them) is intensified at educational institutions.

Matching requirements should not be confused with cost sharing. The latter is generally a contribution by the grantee in support of a project which is agreed upon by the sponsoring agency and the grantee in the course of negotiating an agreement. A matching requirement is specifically mandated by legislation, is of a fixed amount or percentage, and is beyond the control of the sponsoring agency to change.

**Table 5. Matching Fund Requirements**

| Matching Fund Level | No. of Programs |
|---|---|
| No Match required | 88 |
| Varied Matching requirements | 24 |
| Voluntary Match | 2 |
| 5% Match required | 3 |
| 10% Match required | 6 |
| 20% Match required | 1 |
| 25% Match required | 2 |
| 33% Match required | 5 |
| 50% Match required | 1 |
| 75% Match required | 1 |
| 100% Match required | 10 |
| TOTAL | 143 |
| **Matching Fund Composition** | |
| Match Required | No. of Programs |
| No Match required | 88 |
| Dollar Match required | 40 |
| Combination Match of Dollars, Services, Facilities, etc. | 15 |
| TOTAL | 143 |
| **Source of Matching Funds** | |
| Who Matches | No. of Programs |
| No Match | 88 |
| Academic Institution Matches | 17 |
| State Matches | 15 |
| Community Matches | 5 |
| Individual Matches | 2 |
| Combination Source for Match | 16 |
| TOTAL | 143 |

*See Table 5.

*FORMULA GRANTS*

The Federal Government has designed an elaborate and efficient system for collecting revenues; it has not established an equally efficient system for dispensing them. A common method of dispensing funds is the formula grant. Twenty-four of the programs reviewed involve formula funding, with States as recipients in twenty-one of these and academic institutions as recipients in only three.*

Formula funding is essentially a form of multi-year funding, with Federal dollars being distributed to States and institutions in accordance with a carefully worded formula. For example, HEW's Grants for State and Community Programs for Aging specifies that each State shall receive 1% of the available funds, with the remaining funds distributed according to the number of aged living within each State.

The formula grants have two considerable advantages over project grants. First, they provide to the States or educational institutions the assurance that Federal funds will be forthcoming not for one year but for a prolonged period of time. Second, formula grants often require that the States or institutions submit comprehensive plans which specify how funds will be utilized. These State and institutional plans are assembled within general Federal guidelines, and insofar as Federal priorities are articulated, the plans must reflect them. Because of the number of Federal programs which are funded in this manner, States and institutions have developed a considerable number of detailed plans which sometimes bear little relationship to

*See Table 6.

**Table 6. Methods of Fund Disbursement**

| | No. of Programs |
|---|---|
| Project Grants – Unsolicited | 84 |
| Project Grants – Solicited | 10 |
| Formula Grants to States | 21 |
| Formula Grants to Academic Institutions | 3 |
| Fellowships to Individuals | 8 |
| Fellowships to Academic Institutions | 3 |
| Federally Sponsored Projects (no direct disbursement) | 14 |
| TOTAL | 143 |

plans prepared for other formula programs. In one unusual case (the Social and Rehabilitation Services' Juvenile Delinquency Planning, Prevention and Rehabilitation program), the program was originally set up as a formula grant program with $100,000 to be distributed to each State to plan Statewide activities. Because funds were not made available to help States assemble such plans, program funds were ultimately distributed on a project grant basis.

Both the formula grant process and the Cooperative Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture provide proven and demonstrated methods of the effectiveness of the revenue sharing concept. There are others. By requiring States to apply routinely and annually for funds, the Federal government may unintentionally coerce the States, and colleges and universities as well, into unquestioning reliance upon Federal directives. It may also prevent them from developing the kind of long-term planning apparatus that is necessary for State and institutional development. The guarantee of Federal funds over a long-term period for particular purposes is conducive to sound institutional planning, stability and effectiveness. This capability is an obvious prerequisite to effective revenue-sharing.

*CONTRACTS AND PURCHASE ORDERS*

In addition to formula grants and projects grants, there exists within the Federal structure two other common fiscal arrangements between it and academic institutions: contracts and purchase orders. A contract between a Federal agency and either an individual or institution is a direct and easily recorded transaction. Sub-contracts for services by Federal grant recipients is another matter entirely.

At the present time, the Federal Government has no workable system to identify those individuals and institutions whose services are being contracted by direct recipients of Federal grants. In some programs, such contracts are specifically prohibited. In others, like the nutrition program of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration's Center for Disease Control, it is anticipated that the entire program will eventually be on a contract basis. More representative of the actual situation as it now stands within the Federal structure are programs which allow substantial sub-contracting negotiations, such as the Office of Education's Pre-School Elementary and Secondary Personnel Development (grants to States) program, and the Vocational Education Personnel Development program.

A purchase order is a fiscal agreement between a Federal agency and a college or university. It may involve the purchase by the agency of classroom or dormitory space at the university or a particular course to instruct government personnel. The agreement is generally not a financially large one and often involves little more than an institution's taking the opportunity to increase its income, and the agency using the university to baptize one of its activities or to conduct a meeting at a prestige location. The number of such arrangements is large and they, like the prevailing use of subcontracts, have not been systematically studied.

There is one other fiscal arrangement which might be mentioned here, but which involves only Federal agencies. There are provisions that allow one agency to transfer, or "assign," funds to another agency in support of a program to be administered by the latter. This procedure has generally worked well but is little used. An effective example of its use is the Educational Personnel Development–Media Specialists Program. Since the Federal Government encourages States to cooperate on a regional basis, universities on a "consortia" basis, and local communities on an area basis, perhaps it would be appropriate for Federal agencies to act similarly. If Federal programs can not always be effectively coordinated, perhaps at least more program objectives may be achieved if greater use were made of the "assignment" method of funding.

*ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE*

A favorite piece of legislative phrasing is "... and there shall be created...." Through this phrase were established some of the most formidible agencies and bureaus of the American government. The nature of some legislation compels Congress to establish major, new executive departments. More commonly, however, Congress does one of three things: (1) establishes new administrative units within existing departments (the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1970 established a Law Enforcement Assistance Administration within the Department of Justice); (2) states that new legislation be administered by an existing administrative unit (National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966); or (3) leaves to the discretion of the department how legislation will be administered (Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965). This pattern also holds true for Federal legislation affecting grants to the States: (1) Congress may provide

funds for new State agencies; (2) allow funds to be administered by existing agencies; or (3) leave to the discretion of the State how such legislation shall be implemented. (It should be noted here that although Congressional legislation routinely affects administrative units within States, it seldom affects interstate arrangements.)

When legislation is passed which establishes a new administrative unit within an agency, the unit is often set up without careful consideration of its interaction with the current administrative structure of that agency. The agency must simply absorb the new arm to its body, regardless of how unnatural it may appear. Somewhat similarly, when Congress does not indicate how Federal legislation shall be implemented by an agency, bureaus within the agency may claim certain parts of the legislation, and in the process, perhaps, dismantle the original legislation into parts not wholly coordinated with each other. Such was the fate of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, to which both the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Bureau of Higher Education had some claim. What once appeared as a comprehensive and unified program and which reflected the "intent of the Congress" thus risks becoming fragmented and dissembled.

*STATE AND LOCAL ADMINISTRATION*

Many Federal programs have included in their budgets the provisions to staff program units at the State level. This is common, for instance, in many of the programs administered by the Bureau of Education Personnel Development in the Office of Education. Many agencies have set up programs to reach the same clientele in the same geographic areas; for example, the disadvantaged youth of urban areas: HUD's Model Cities program; Agriculture's School Lunch Program; Labor; and many programs in OEO and HEW. (The Office of Education alone has nearly forty programs directed toward the disadvantaged.) In many States there are State officials responsible for coordinating within that State a variety of Federal programs. Our review indicates that many of these positions remain vacant for prolonged periods and that in some cases this coordination function is merely a part-time activity.

The increasing number of Federal executive agencies concerned with domestic problems, particularly in the areas of education and social welfare, has brought the Federal government closer to local communities, including clusters of communities within large metropolitan areas, than at any time in the past. At the national level, Federal programs appear mammouth and sprawling; but at the local level their size may take on more manageable dimensions. Control and "ownership" of these programs, consequently, become volatile issues, and they become exceptionally so when these programs touch closely on basic social issues, expectations and frustrations. The dangers of politicizing these programs at the local level are real, and what once may have been conceived as a "community" is transformed into a "constituency."

In general, the history of how Federal programs operate within the States remains an undocumented one. An exception to this is the Department of Agriculture's Cooperative Extension Service, which has one of the most historically workable systems of implementing programs within the States. (See page 55). Primary planning evolves from the county agents and county policy planning committees, who work closely and simultaneously with area agents, State extension directors and State policy planning committees. All cooperate with the Federal Extension Service and other State agencies in implementing Cooperative Extension programs. Yet the Extension Service model remains relatively unique and rarely emulated, Other programs appear to suffer from inadequate structures within the States which can relate well both to State agencies and to Federal organizations on programs of joint concern and common interest.

*FEDERAL REGIONAL OFFICES*

These issues are related to the increased interest in government circles of the roles the regional offices of the various agencies are to play in the future administration of Federal programs. There are approximately ten regional offices operated by these agencies. The geographic boundaries for these regions are not always the same from agency to agency, but efforts are underway to make them congruent. It is difficult to establish any consistent pattern as to how these offices are used and how they can be used in better ways. In theory, the regional offices are intended to provide on-site support to Federal programs and to cooperate with State and local agencies in implementing these programs. Some agencies such as the Social and Rehabilitation Service, Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development have expressed a determination to involve these offices more convincingly in program decision matters, and to use them to implement this Administration's conviction that the Federal government should respond more directly and relevantly to the concerns of States and communities.

Along with revenue sharing, the concept of "regionalization" is a major component of the New Federalism. The assumption behind this concept is that government units regionally located can more effectively and quickly respond to local and regional needs. There are many who question this assumption and doubt that there is any evidence to indicate that regional offices are better equipped to do this than national offices. These critics feel that officials at regional offices are no better informed about national programs and local priorities than State and local officials and college and university officials located at the sites of program implementation.

*FISCAL MANAGEMENT*

One of the most consistently strident notes in the Federal government-grantee relationship, be it at the regional offices or elsewhere, is the question of a grantee's program budget. It is a traditional rule of the Federal government that the people who manage the budgets are not the same as those who manage the programs which those budgets are intended to support. The fiscal managers are concerned with economy and cost accountability; the program managers with program objectives and effectiveness. The interests of one often conflict with the interests of the other, even though attempts at new budgetary techniques have tried to narrow this gap of antagonism.

Grant recipients have routine contact with program managers, but are often mystified by the guidelines and practices of the fiscal managers. It is also true that many program managers in the Federal government are often uneasy about many of these guidelines and practices. There are given times of the year when grantees urgently need fiscal information or program commitments and are obstructed from getting them because of the clashes built into this system.

*UNIVERSITY-FEDERAL RELATIONS*

The need for more meaningful communication between Federal agencies and, in particular, institutions of higher education is evident in another area as well. There are occasions when a Federal agency is either compelled or voluntarily decides to curtail a program. This may be done as a result of the termination of legislative authority, or it may result from administrative decisions. In either case, many such decisions are made without formal dialogue with the State and local agencies, colleges and universities, which will be profoundly affected by the decision.* A good example of this practice is the current trend within Federal agencies to cut back on their graduate fellowship programs, especially in fields where it is felt that professionals are being over-produced.

There are few channels existing within the government whereby institutions may appeal such unilateral decisions. Typically, therefore, such an appeal may occur outside the usual channels of communication between the government and educational institutions: resort to political supporters and intense lobbying efforts replace the normal forms of dialogue. Even when it is recognized that a decision to phase out a program may be a wise one, there are those who argue that the Federal agency should adopt a practice of "gradualism" for such phasing out, to avoid the trauma of sudden and complete fund withdrawal.

*INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY*

As desirable as this practice would be for academic institutions, these institutions must also be aware of the increasing requests for "accountability." There is no question that any institution of higher learning–or any State or local government–which elects to receive Federal funds must be subjected to a variety of reports and audits. A *pro forma* report, however, is no substitute for sound monitoring of the grant's effectiveness, nor is a fiscal audit a substitute for a substantive evaluation. Many in academic institutions feel there is too much pressure on them to achieve strictly government-defined objectives. At the same time, many in government feel that there is little the government can or wants to do that risks intruding into the academic freedom of universities.

This raises several basic and important questions. Should universities and colleges be subject to the same demands for quality performance and adherence to timetables that are required of commercial organizations? Is the decision to provide funds solely to prestigious universities a sufficient enough reason to believe that quality performance is taking place? If so, what is to happen when funds are provided to less prestigious institutions, and especially to developing institutions?

*PROGRAM INFORMATION*

There is still no adequate central information system to make available the results of educational activities of the Federal Government. The need is most direly felt for the vast number of past and current education programs sponsored by the various agencies. When one considers that thousands of pilot projects were funded and terminated, and that many of them were research and demonstration projects of high scholarly interest or functional utility, it is

**Table 7. Primary Channels of Fund Disbursement**

| Federal Government To: | No. of Programs |
|---|---|
| Academic Institutions | 69 |
| States | 25 |
| Individuals | 12 |
| Academic Institutions, States & Communities | 11 |
| Academic Institutions and States | 6 |
| Communities | 7 |
| Academic Institutions and Individuals | 5 |
| Academic Institutions, States and Individuals | 1 |
| Communities and Individuals | 1 |
| Federally Sponsored Projects (no direct disbursement) | 6 |
| TOTAL | 143 |

*See Table 7.

unfortunate that the history of these projects and their effects has never been documented.

How many of these projects deserve to be forgotten and how many remembered no one will ever know. It probably would not be too risky to guess that a project which is presently being hailed as bold and innovative may be identical to one that was abolished several years ago for reasons now forgotten or no longer relevant.

Perhaps this is one reason why academic institutions are disposed to look upon some Federal agencies primarily as sources for funds, rather than as sources of intellectual strength, technical assistance and tested information. This condition is particularly true of the Office of Education, where despite long-standing efforts to establish dependable information retrieval and delivery systems for educational activities, results to date fall below expectations and needs.

On a lesser scale, however, the Office of Education has succeeded in establishing an effective information collection and retrieval system. The Office has recently established a National Student Transfer Record Center in Little Rock, Arkansas, to keep current academic and health information on each child benefitting from its program in support of educationally deprived migrant children.

## *PROGRAM MONITORING AND EVALUATION*

Depending upon the agency and the program concerned, monitoring of a Federally funded program varies from an oppressively detailed and demanding reporting–leading to charges of smothering bureaucratic intervention–to a simple inability of a small central staff to understand what is happening in a program that may have ballooned into hundreds of projects involving thousands of individuals. This latter case is particularly true when the Congress or an administration allocates new funds to an old program without providing additional funds to administer the enlarged program.

There is little sound evaluation within the Federal Government on past or current programs. Despite the continuity of their funding, most Federal agencies can not give the Congress assurances that these programs are performing well or badly, and whether they are achieving the purposes Congress intended them to achieve.

Program and staffing funds for many agency activities tend to increase substantially over the years. What seldom increases are funds and staff efforts to evaluate these activities. Even when the initiative to evaluate a particular program exists, evaluation funds are frequently lacking. And too often, an honest evaluation poses too many threats to the careers of individuals or the reputations of institutions to obtain wholehearted support and cooperation.

When an effort is made to determine how and why programs are initiated and terminated, the effort leads predictably to decisions once made by individuals whose names alone are remembered and whose functions have long ago been reorganized or terminated. The search one might make for the continuity and rationale for major decisions is repeatedly undermined by the turnover of personnel, the expiration of administrations, the lack of precedents, and the paucity of relevant data and of intelligent critiques which are systematically recorded and made accessible for the future.

## *PLANNING*

If, because of faulty documentation, there is doubt about what *has* happened in the past in a program area; and if, because of a faulty monitoring system, there is further doubt about what *is* happening, the compounded problem makes it even more doubtful that responsible individuals will be able to determine what *should* be happening. Planning is therefore too often an exercise in intellectual ingenuity which begins from no concrete base and leads to a preconceived set of objectives divorced from the present and unrelated to the past.

Programs must have a focus. There must be something in them that is considered worth achieving in proportion to the time, effort and money expended. However, when a monitoring system works only in spasms, and when an evaluation system works hardly at all, the odds against a planning unit achieving what it hopes to achieve–an identifiable list of priorities and a feasible method of implementing them–become increasingly great. This situation is further complicated by the fact that 60% of all programs reviewed in our study involved the submission and receipt of *unsolicited* project proposals. Only ten programs (7%) involved solicited proposals.*

## *PRIORITIES*

In large measure, the basic priorities in education have been articulated through legislation, and reflect the compromises and the realities of the political process. Changes in these priorities are evident, particularly during the past decade of social ferment and increasing Federal responsibility for social programs of far-reaching dimensions. Yet this explains priority formulation only at the macro level. At the micro levels, where the actual business of making laws vital or inert by numerous small decisions made daily by thousands of government employees takes place, there are few standards for testing small decisions against large priorities. Indeed, many of those making the small decisions–which in sum comprise the major thrust of national priorities–are either oblivious or unsympathetic to the priorities set by the legislative process. Their own value systems, their organizational goals and their own intellectual bents tend to shape, eventually, national policy.

What is needed most, and what exists least, are agency policies and guidelines which successfully bridge the

*See Table 6, page 27.

gap between law and practice, and which give common effect to decision-making at all administrative levels. Without such policies, administration of law becomes a feudal system wherein each baron prescribes for his own domain, and neither Congress nor the President is in full control. □

# URBAN EXTENSION: THE NEED FOR STRUCTURE

Institutional change is as urgent a requirement for the nation's universities as it is for the nation's cities. For a long time, many universities have had a standing and sometimes extraordinarily productive relationship with both the Federal government and the various State governments. Only recently have universities begun to have a similar relationship with municipal governments. Often the two have been at bitter odds.

Fears linger in academia that to make closer contact with municipal governments risks politicizing the universities. Many believe that education is too important to be concerned about politics. Others believe that politics is too important for education not to be concerned.

Bitterness lingers at City Hall. It is a bitterness that stems from the isolation with which the universities have separated themselves from their largely urban surroundings, not only in New York and Chicago, but in Columbus, Ohio, as well. This bitterness stems also from a conviction that much of what the universities do is irrelevant to the highly combustible problems of the urban areas, and the belief that universities themselves contribute to these problems.

There are some indications that this pattern of antagonism is changing. Many municipal governments are experiencing the rise of a new kind of politician—and a new kind of public servant—who is less concerned about maintaining his political power base and defending the administrative structures of the past, then he is about finding new ways to solve urgent problems. At the universities, too, there is appearing a new generation of scholars who see the urban environment as their legitimate concern and who are developing new disciplines and enlarging old ones in response to that concern.

When institutional change comes, either at City Hall or Old Main, it comes slowly. Institutions take time to build; they take time to change, even when the press of events demands speed. To get political decision-makers and academic researchers and scholars to join in common effort is itself often a slow process. The fact that Federally supported programs have often speeded up this process is itself important and encouraging.

For decades, the leadership in municipal governments has been compelled to make decisions about the future of the cities without access to the kinds of substantial research that such decisions require. Too often the decisions have resulted simply from political savvy about what can get done at a given time, or from the highly refined antennae of a politician, which periodically signal him when something is right for the times.

The unexpected thing about this history of "savviness" is that it has sometimes worked. The expected thing, however, is that it also has routinely failed to work: as a consequence American cities are in deep trouble. Universities, too, are in trouble, but perhaps not so fundamentally. And they are not so much in trouble that they are not capable of helping the cities, even when there are risks involved.

## *UNIVERSITY-BASED URBAN PROGRAMS*

Over the past two decades, universities have increasingly sought to serve cities both in institutionalized ways and as the result of individual research and inquiry. Many universities have developed substantial departments and courses focussed on the nature and problems of urban life. Some have developed urban centers and institutes. The Program of Urban and Policy Sciences at the Stony Brook campus of the State University of New York goes even further and combines multi-disciplinary teaching, research and extension within a single administrative unit. As a rule, however, much of what happens at the university, and which is designed to turn the attention of the university towards the cities, happens disjointly and independently of other efforts within the university.

Schools of extension and continuing education are never the sole administrative units at a university through which its urban activities are operated. In many instances, they are not even among the major units, despite the logic suggesting that they play the lead role in involving various parts of the university in community service. Instead, the

university typically reacts to demands on its services sporadically and in pieces and parts. The university's contributions to the solution of urban problems remain largely unplanned, unorganized and uncontrolled from within. The School of Public Health, the Department of Sociology and the School of Public Administration are all apt to be simultaneously involved without any interchange of ideas or even the mutual knowledge that these involvements exist.

## *FEDERAL FRAGMENTATION*

This same disjointedness characterizes Federal programs aimed at involving universities in the solution of urban problems. The Office of Economic Opportunity sponsors programs aimed at urban problems; so does the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Interior, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Transportation and even the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. Furthermore, the concern of the Justice Department with crime inevitably leads to a concern with urban life, just as the Department of Agriculture's concern with nutrition cannot end at the city line.

Because urban affairs constitute a large slice of our national life, there are few central tendencies among the various programs which deal with the problems of the city: poverty, crime, drug addiction, mass transportation, land use, employment, sanitation, architecture, housing, health and environment are among the program fields which interact with urban life. Each of these fields seeks to draw upon university resources and to involve the university in the kinds of programs typical of each field. For the most part, these fragmented demands upon the university reinforce and complicate the patterns of fragmentation already existing in the university structure.

If the university is to meet these demands in some systematic and comprehensive way, structures within the university are needed to organize and apply the resources of the university, just as a structure was developed in the land grant universities to serve the diverse needs of rural life.

## *URBAN PROBLEMS AND EXTENSION NEEDS*

Persons concerned about the lack of focus and concentrated effort in urban extension frequently point to the Cooperative Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture as a model to be emulated for the cities. In fact, an initial concept behind the enactment of Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 was to provide a working system for urban extension which would provide cohesion and direction to a university's involvement with urban problems. However, this concept does not clearly emerge from the final statutory language, and the level of Title I funding in itself precludes giving the concept operational life.

The problems of urban America are different in scope and kind from the problems of rural America on which the Cooperative Extension Service has had a large and successful impact. The sheer magnitude of urban problems is what weakens the will of those who would most want to move and change the world. Seven out of every ten Americans live in urban America. Half the population of the United States lives on one percent of the nation's land.

It is this intense concentration of people and problems in urban areas that represents the first great barrier to a solution of urban problems. Where there is this concentration, walls and barricades go up out of necessity; territories are marked off; responsibilities are assigned; authority is delegated; neighborhoods zoned and political districts gerrymandered. Urban problems are institutionalized in a way that rural problems never were.

Most urban problems are linked with most other urban problems. To solve one, seemingly, commits you to solving all. To begin an inquiry into one problem leads you down dark and endless corridors to an indeterminate point. The dilemma: how to make urban problems more vulnerable to inquiry and solution; and how to deal from a fragmented university base with problems which are inescapably intertwined.

One current approach is to attack these problems on a neighborhood basis. At that level, it is thought, the problems that exist on a city-wide basis can be better seen and confronted as an entity. This experimental approach has been adopted in a number of Federal program efforts. Yet the evidence to date indicates that while the magnitude of urban problems is reduced by this approach, their solution becomes no less elusive.

Frustration with the intractibility of urban problems has led to disappointment with current approaches and a search for better solutions. At the root of this search is the need to develop within universities an organized capacity for urban extension. Until this is done, the value of university involvement is diminished because the crucial link between the scholar and the community does not exist. Yet providing this link will entail a massive joint effort on the part of universities, cities and the Federal government, an effort far beyond that foreseen by any current Federal urban program of continuing education.

## *MANPOWER AND ORGANIZATION FOR EDUCATION*

Many of the research and public service responsibilities of universities are operated by the "outer" university, whose functions separate it from the traditional teaching activities of the "inner" university. Most extension and community service activities have been centered at these outer universities, and it is assumed that urban extension too should be centered in the outer university. It

is at the outer university where agricultural extension activities, including the field stations, have been located. Here too are housed most of the subject-matter specialists who provide the research that is essential to agricultural extension. These specialists, as well as the generalists (the county agents), represent the manpower that has made agricultural extension effective.

What kind of manpower universities would need for urban extension is a critical question. What proportion would need to be specialists in health, housing and other fields and what proportion should be generalists in urban life; how would they be financed and what would be their status within a university?

The caliber, kind and number of people engaged in urban extension are the keys to providing the "delivery system" needed to convey research findings to an urban clientele and in turn to relay to researchers the problems which require investigation. Unless some form of urban extension framework is created, universities will have too little opportunity to affect one of the great tragedies of American life: the inability to control the growth and quality of American cities. Concurrently, although many Federal programs address themselves to this problem and involve universities in support of Federal and municipal activity, they have rarely resulted in formation of stable, broad structures through which universities can most effectively provide assistance to city officials and urban residents. Rather, these Federal programs tend to use what the university has available in terms of existing talent and present organizational capabilities. This has led to much activity but to less progress.

By often funding programs which reinforce the separation of academic disciplines, and the separation of research from extension, the Federal government bears considerable responsibility for the current inability of universities to respond to urban problems more effectively. Conversely, the government has great opportunities to effect needed change. A recent indication of an improved approach toward university involvement in urban affairs is the Research Applied to National Needs Program (RANN) funded by the National Science Foundation. By specifically requiring that research be oriented to the solution of social problems, and that the university accept a responsibility for providing extension services, RANN has generated a number of multi-disciplinary programs which have already had significant impact on urban areas and on the organization of universities.

The success of the agricultural extension effort depended on both a national commitment to the improvement of rural life and the development of university structures appropriate to this purpose. In diverse and scattered ways, universities are groping towards the creation of new administrative structures which will be appropriate to urban extension. What is needed now is the same kind of Federal commitment to the improvement of the quality of urban life which was once devoted to the development of a backward rural society. □

# THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

*In the Panel's view, as acceptance grows of the responsibility of Government to provide access to educational opportunity for its citizens commensurate with their ability, motivation, and the needs of society, so will acceptance grow of changes required to make the discharge of that responsibility a reality. These changes are most likely to include a shift to greater governmental and student financing of educational opportunity, a relative decrease in parental responsibility for the increased number of students from low-income families, and increased student or parental contribution expectations where there is a capacity to pay higher charges.*

This is a conclusion reached by the Panel on Student Financial Need Analysis and stated in a 1971 study published by the College Entrance Examination Board called *New Approaches to Student Financial Aid.* Underlying this statement is the Panel's conviction that the present system of providing financial assistance to students is inadequate. The Panel uses such terms as "irregular" and "inequitable" to describe that system.

The present system rests primarily on the extent to which students and their parents can meet the educational expenses of higher education. It is clear that the Panel advocates a stronger contribution by the Federal and State governments to student financial assistance if the system itself is to become more stable and equitable.

The Federal government is already involved in providing assistance to students through a variety of substantial and beneficial ways, although there continues to be a major controversy over whether such assistance should go directly to the students or directly to educational institutions.

The Federal government has traditionally provided financial assistance to students at the post-secondary level through one of three channels: direct grants, work-study programs and loans. Increasingly this assistance is being provided, or "packaged," through a combination of these three, with additional Federal assistance being made available through such long-standing government benefit program as the GI Bill and Social Security. These combinations are taking place out of necessity–sufficient funds are simply not available in any one form–and because it is believed that the kind of assistance made available to students affects considerably the kind of education they receive.

For reasons which should be obvious, the most popular form of government assistance among both students and institutions is the direct grant (fellowships, scholarships, etc.). These grants have generally been awarded on the basis of academic merit, and involve no future indebtedness on the part of the recipient. Grants are popular because they allow students to devote themselves full-time to their academic careers. In addition, it is conceded that direct grants are the least cumbersome form of Federal assistance to administer.

Work-study programs are less popular than grants, but among many students are more acceptable than loans. Work-study programs help students support themselves without incurring any debt, but, at the same time, require that they spend less time pursuing their academic studies.

Loans appear the least sought-after form of financial assistance from the student standpoint. Many students shy away from loans for the simple reason that they hesitate to incur debts that will obligate them for many years to come. Students are also reluctant to negotiate loans with private and unfamiliar lending institutions, even when those loans are guaranteed by the Federal and State governments and, in effect, provide them with interest subsidization. To the extent that government loans are available through a student's own academic institution, most students apparently prefer this source to any other.

Students from low-income families and minority groups have given some indication that they prefer work-study programs to loans. There is evidence that some commercial lending institutions are reluctant to provide loans to such individuals because of what they claim to be the excessive risks involved–poor credit rating, less assurance of future earning power, employment instability, geographic mobility, etc.

*GI BILL*

The earliest and classic form of Federal assistance to students at the post-secondary level is the GI Bill, which went into effect in 1944. Since that year, the GI Bill has provided over $22 billion to veterans to support their educational activities. What is unique about the Bill is that it is based neither on merit nor need nor any other discriminating criteria: it is a benefit to which virtually every veteran is entitled. This lack of discriminating criteria is a major reason why the GI Bill is so enviably simple to administer.

As originally conceived, the GI Bill consisted of two payments: one payment to the veteran as a subsistence allowance, and one payment to his institution to cover, in part, his educational expenses. The Bill eventually evolved into a single payment to the individual in partial support of both his subsistence and educational expenses.

*SOCIAL SECURITY*

Another important form of Federal assistance to students are the benefits available to them through Social Security. Since 1935, the year social security benefits were established, payments to children of deceased or disabled parents were restricted to dependents under eighteen years of age. As a result of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, however, payments were extended to dependents between the ages of eighteen and twenty-two, but only if during those years the dependents continued their education on a full-time basis.

In FY 1971, over 580,000 dependents between the ages of eighteen and twenty-two received benefits totalling $624,000,000. Like the GI Bill, these social security benefits are simply and effectively administered and involve a routine monthly check sent directly to the dependent or to his surviving parent. Payments are made immediately after an application is filed with the Social Security Administration and after both the individual and institution have confirmed that the dependent had been admitted and enrolled at the institution for a full-time course of study.

Both the GI Bill and the social security benefits attest to the incomparable taxing power of the Federal government to provide such benefits and guarantee their delivery over an extended length of time. There are other major Federal assistance programs for students currently in operation, but none of them approaches these two programs in size or longevity. Recognition of these facts led the Panel on Student Financial Need Analysis to state the following:

> *A cherished myth of educators and the general public is that student financial aid today is primarily based on relative need. However, when the source and application of all aid funds (including the GI Bill, Social Security, athletic grants, and scholarships from restricted funds) are considered, the greater amount of student aid appears to be beyond institutional control and is commonly awarded on the basis of criteria other than need.*
>
> *(New Approaches, p. 9)*

Traditionally, most Federal grant programs have been based on academic merit. In the 1960s, however, major changes took place in Federal assistance programs which resulted in emphasis on programs for the disadvantaged. This emphasis brought about a substantial change in how financial assistance programs were administered by both Federal agencies and academic institutions.

*FEDERAL LEGISLATION*

Three major peices of Federal legislation have had a broad and overwhelming impact of Federal financial assistance to students: The National Defense Education Act of 1958; the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; and the Higher Education Act of 1965. The Economic Opportunity Act (Title I, Part C) was later amended so that the work-study provisions of that title could be incorporated into the Higher Education Act (Title IV, Part C).

The Higher Education Act provided two notable student assistance programs. Title IV, Part A, provided Educational Opportunity Grants to students of exceptional need; and Title IV, Part B, established a system of low-interest insured loans to students in institutions of higher education.

*LOANS*

Both the National Defense Education Act and the Higher Education Act have provisions for student loans. Both programs grant eligibility to students who are registered on at least a half-time basis, with decisions regarding what constitutes half-time enrollment left to the institutions. There are, however, important differences between the two programs.

NDEA student loans are specifically designed to aid needy students at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The program is institutionally based, with the result that applicants apply directly to their institutions for loans. As a consequence, institutions have considerable discretionary power to decide who is or who is not a "needy" student, and who is or who is not enrolled "half-time" or "full-time."

The HEA student loan program does not have an institutional base. This guaranteed student loan program is operated through such private lenders as banks, credit unions, savings and loan associations, pension funds, insurance companies and academic institutions. It is the responsibility of the student to locate a lending institution which will offer him a loan.

A more important distinction between NDEA and HEA loan services is that HEA was established to assist a much broader segment of the population. NDEA loans are restricted to the needy; HEA loans are not. In addition,

NDEA has a forgiveness clause for those who enter the teaching profession, as well as a matching formula that requires an institution to match at a one to nine ratio the Federal contribution.

During FY 70, it is estimated that $287,147,000 was loaned through NDEA to approximately 455,800 students at nearly 2,000 colleges and universities. In that same period, it is estimated that through HEA approximately $839,666,000 was loaned to 921,000 students at over 7,500 institutions of higher education and vocational education in this country and abroad.

*WORK STUDY*

The Federal government's support of work-study programs was first expressed in the Higher Education Act, and later reinforced in the Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1968. Title IV, Part C, of HEA was designed to promote the part-time employment of students, with particular emphasis on students from low-income families, who need assistance to pursue courses of study at higher education institutions. Only full-time students are eligible in this program, with part-time students specifically barred from eligibility.

The Vocational Education Act Amendments, Title I, Part H, provide grant support to States via State boards of vocational education for work-study programs to assist economically disadvantaged full-time vocational education students, ages 15-20, to remain in school by providing part-time employment with local education agencies and other public agencies.

Students involved in this program are primarily at the secondary level. In FY 70, for instance, 82.4% of the students were enrolled at the secondary level, with 17.6% enrolled at the post-secondary level, primarily at two-year colleges.

In FY 70, the HEA work-study program provided $154,650,000 to 2,177 post-secondary institutions which employed about 400,000 students. In that same period, the Vocational Education work-study program provided $4,250,000 to assist 21,000 needy students.

*EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS*

The Educational Opportunity Grants program enacted by the Higher Education Act provides project grants to institutions of higher learning. The program is designed to enable students of exceptional financial need to pursue higher education by providing direct grant assistance for educational expenses. Institutions must match the Federal contribution on a dollar-to-dollar basis. Grants are restricted to full-time students whose "exceptional" needs are to be determined by the institution itself.

In FY 70, the EOG program enabled 280,000 students to begin or pursue their education at nearly 2,000 institutions at a cost to the Federal government of $164,000,000.

The magnitude of Federal financial assistance to students indicates beyond a doubt that the demands for assistance are great. The variety of ways in which this assistance is provided indicates that no single formula for student assistance is adequate to meet the need.

Two of the most substantial programs providing education benefits to students–the GI Bill and Social Security–are being effectively administered through two of the oldest and best-tested mechanisms the government has thus far established to disburse funds. Other programs that have significant dimensions are confined primarily to student assistance through loans. These are popular with the current Administration, but noticeably less popular with students.

Of particular significance to those who are concerned with the fate of higher continuing education, is the government's reluctance to provide support to part-time students. Except for veterans and military and civilian personnel of the U.S. government, few work-study programs or direct grant programs exist within the entire Federal structure to benefit part-time students. □

# INDEPENDENT STUDY

There are nearly 1,000 correspondence schools in the United States. They have an enrollment estimated at over five million persons. In addition to the traditional lesson plans and written materials, some experimenting is occurring with various forms of recorded, broadcast, televised and programmed instruction. The principal form of independent study, however, is still the traditional "correspondence course."

Independent study (or "home study") usually means enrollment with an educational institution which provides a series of lessons the student can complete at his own pace and at a time and place of his own choosing. As a result, independent study is suited to the needs of the adult when time, distance or cost interfere with enrollment in standard "classroom" programs.

## *QUALITY AND KINDS OF INSTITUTIONS*

Educational institutions offering independent study courses vary widely in kind and quality. Most of them are proprietary schools, some of which have developed reputations for taking money from the credulous and offering little educational substance in return. The activities of unscrupulous entrepreneurs have undoubtedly tarnished the image of independent study, and despite Federal Trade Commission oversight and attempts at accreditation by the Office of Education, fly-by-night institutions do exist. When exposed, some simply change their names and addresses and continue to operate until again forced out of business.

In an attempt to bring greater integrity to this field, a number of the more stable and influential proprietary institutions have formed the National Home Study Council, headquartered in Washington, D.C. and charged with developing and enforcing a code of ethics. The Council has established an Accrediting Commission, recognized by the Office of Education, which passes judgments on the quality of educational services and the advertising practices of proprietary institutions.

Many colleges and universities offer correspondence courses and other approaches to independent study. Most of them are affiliated with the Correspondence Study Division of the National University Extension Association, and many of their courses can be applied to credit toward a degree. In addition, a number of degree programs which feature a combination of independent study and short periods of resident instruction have been created. The model for many of these programs has been the pioneering effort at the University of Oklahoma in its Bachelor of Liberal Studies program. Using its B.L.S. model, and a curriculum developed in consultation with the U.S. Civil Service Commission, the University of Oklahoma subsequently added a highly successful program leading to the masters degree in Public Administration.

## *FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT*

There is little direct Federal support for independent study; however, through the G.I. Bill and correspondence study programs for military personnel on active duty, Federal funds are indirectly channeled toward independent study programs. Estimates vary, but probably more than one-half of all correspondence study enrollments come from veterans and military personnel. Through USAFI alone, there were nearly 400,000 enrollments among military personnel in FY 1970, and similar correspondence training is available through arrangements made within each of the three services. In addition, the guaranteed loan program, established under the Higher Education Act, permits students to borrow up to $1,500 for independent study through an accredited institution, provided that they carry a sufficient course load.

## *COMPLETION AND MOTIVATION*

Independent study requires a highly motivated student; the drop-out factor is high. For example, research conducted at the University of Iowa by J. William Pfeiffer

and Darrell Sabers for correspondence study with that institution indicates that for one-semester hour correspondence study courses, 13% of the enrollees do not submit even one lesson; for four-semester hour courses, 32% do not complete the first lesson. However, for those who get by the hurdle of the first lesson, the completion rate is quite good. This same research shows that while the completion rate for a four-semester hour course is only 23.6%, the drop-out rate for those who have completed the first one-fourth of the course is sharply reduced.

## *TECHNOLOGY*

Independent study programs, despite successful beginnings, have been slow to use portable projectors and cassettes as well as the more sophisticated technologies to personalize, improve or expand their course offerings. Written lessons and written instructional materials still dominate. The technology by which to offer alternative modes of learning has long been in existence, but the capacity to package learning in ways which can advantageously use technology has lagged behind.

## *FUTURE DIRECTIONS*

Advocates of independent study believe that its potential has barely been tapped. They view two major audiences—housewives and prisoners—as a primary clientele for vastly expanded independent study programs. Certainly, if independent study is to progress, it must expand its clientele base beyond dominant reliance on the serviceman and the veteran pursuing work under the G.I. Bill. The direction of such an expansion, particularly for courses at post-secondary levels, appears however to depend on several related factors.

One of these factors is the rate of progress toward expanded external degree efforts. If the external degree concept develops a firm foundation and obtains increased acceptance, programs of independent study will experience accelerated demand. Another influencing factor lies in the ability to use educational technology effectively to reach people with educational offerings which have a broad appeal. Much more needs to be done in this regard. In addition, if forms of direct Federal support can be obtained to provide tuition assistance for the needy part-time student and to underwrite the development of educational materials geared to new educational technology for independent study, the prospects for substantial improvement and expansion are high. Finally, better forms of quality control, whether from within or without, could do much to insure that institutions and course offerings have educational integrity and validity. If by this means the taint of phony certificates, false claims and inferior educational offerings could be removed, the acceptance of, and participation in, independent study would be strongly benefitted. □

# DATA ANALYSIS AND PROGRAM CLUSTERS

## *ANALYSIS OF PROGRAMS SUPPORTING INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES*

Teaching is the central purpose of the university. Recent attention to the development of ways universities can more effectively become involved in assisting communities to ameliorate social problems obscures the major contribution made by institutions of higher education in training a wide variety of personnel in numerous fields and specialties. Ninety-five of the 143 programs reviewed in this study support instructional services.* Total Federal expenditures on these programs were $2,062,024,000, of which $1,082,329,000 went to colleges and universities. In addition the total Federal expenditures on programs supporting research application was $2,029,573,000, of which only $357,341,000 went to colleges and universities. In effect, therefore, of the total Federal expenditure of $4,091,597,000 on programs which, in whole or in part, support activities of extension, continuing education and community services, a total of $1,439,670,000 goes to colleges and universities.

Two priorities in terms of Federal expenditures are the training of educational personnel and the provision of educational opportunities for veterans. A separate case study in this report, "The Federal Government and the Training of Teachers and Educational Personnel" (see page 65), discusses how the nature of Federal support has been shaped by an unresolved debate about the proper role of the Federal government in terms of education. An analysis of educational benefits available to veterans is contained in another case study in this report, "Veterans Administration: The G.I. Bill Education and Training" (see page 78). That study suggests that there is minimal cooperation between institutions of higher education and the Federal government in terms of the development of programs addressed to the needs of veterans.

*See Table 8 for program breakdown by title and administering agency.

## *PROGRAM PURPOSE*

A beginning step to understanding the nature of Federal support for instructional services is to consider the purpose for which the programs were intended.

*Program Purpose*

| *Program Addressed to* | *Number of Programs* | *Federal Expenditures* |
|---|---|---|
| Educational Personnel Development | 36 | $ 281,113,000 |
| Public Health (Personnel Development and Community Services) | 19 | 248,841,000 |
| Vocational Education | 7 | 23,848,000 |
| Misc. Education for the General Public | 9 | 12,168,000 |
| Veteran's Education | 3 | 1,032,753,000 |
| Community Problems | | |
| a. Environmental Problems | 5 | 9,395,000 |
| b. Problems of the Disadvantaged | 5 | 215,730,000 |
| c. Crime and Delinquency | 4 | 202,501,000 |
| d. Multi-purpose | 7 | 35,676,000 |
| | 95 | $2,062,025,000* |

The provision of educational benefits for veterans is the single largest effort in the area of instructional services. The second largest area is professional development for health and educational personnel; 55 of the 95 programs are directed to one of those two purposes.

*All figures are rounded to the nearest $1,000, which results in slight differences in totals.



847

*PROGRAM CLIENTELE*

A chart showing a distribution of programs by program clientele confirms the emphasis on benefits for veterans and professional development.

*Program Clientele*

| *Clientele* | *Number of Programs* | *Federal Expenditures* |
|---|---|---|
| Education Professions | 31 | $ 211,478,000 |
| Disadvantaged | 12 | 290,214,000 |
| Health Professions | 21 | 175,809,000 |
| Universities and Colleges | 3 | 8,561,000 |
| Miscellaneous Categories | 9 | 89,724,000 |
| State and Local Governments | 2 | 9,535,000 |
| Veterans | 3 | 1,032,753,000 |
| Qualified Professionals | 14 | 243,949,000 |
| | 95 | $2,062,023,000 |

A thorough analysis of each of these 95 programs is beyond the scope of this study. The case studies previously mentioned trace the historical development of Federal support for instructional services serving two major groups of clientele and analyze some of the most significant issues concerning Federal-university involvement. What is possible are some general observations on the characteristics of programs supported by those Federal agencies most directly involved in this field.

*OFFICE OF EDUCATION*

The majority of the programs (59) are funded through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; 27 of these programs are administered by the Office of Education. The primary focus of most of these programs is the training or retraining of educational personnel in terms of a predefined national need or occupational shortage. For example, there are discrete programs for each of the following categories: media specialists, teacher trainers, librarians, and recreation personnel who work with the handicapped. The typical pattern is to award funds to a college or university which in turn selects recipients of fellowships.

Another common characteristic of these programs is the involvement of State education agencies. Ten of the programs provide opportunities for funding of these agencies for the operation of programs; in most cases, funding is competitive, with other State agencies and institutions of higher education also eligible for funds. For five of the programs, funds are granted directly to the State agency for disbursement or program operation. Two programs grant funds to the State Boards of Vocational Education, and one program allows each State Board of Vocational Education to submit the name of a candidate who will then be trained at a university in vocational education. This heavy involvement of State education agencies confirms the importance of developing competence in educational planning at the State level.

A review of these programs also reveals the dependence on colleges and universities for help in solving current social problems. The Education Professions Development Act provides funds to State education agencies to train teams of drug educators to use available curricula and materials and to stimulate the development of preventive programs at the local school level. Colleges and universities have provided in-service training and other technical assistance services to support these program purposes. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Education Professions Development Act both provide funds for training of school personnel in ways which will alleviate stresses resulting from school desegregation.

Conspicuous by their absence are programs which are addressed to reform or innovation in the school system. One notable exception is the Teacher Corps program, which stresses community involvement in education and provides funds for the improvement of university curricula. Another exception is the Career Opportunities Program, funded through the Education Professions Development Act, which provides training for low-income community residents and Vietnam veterans so that they may work as education auxiliaries in poverty areas. (A substantial part of the case study "The Federal Government and the Training of Teacher and Educational Personnel" is devoted to an analysis of this program. See page 65.)

*NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH*

By agency, the second largest group of programs (17) is funded through the National Institutes of Health. Primarily directed to increasing the competence of professionals in medical research, these programs differ from those funded through the Office of Education in their greater emphasis on providing fellowships to individuals, rather than granting support to institutions. The pattern of funding for fellowships in General Medical Sciences is typical of several of the programs funded through NIH. Three categories of awards are available: Post-doctoral, Special, and Career Development; the difference among the awards is the degree of professional experience of the recipient. (Awards supporting predoctoral candidates are currently being phased out, and Career Awards are being continued only at the current level.)

Four NIH programs are focused on the development of new teaching curricula for the retraining of health professionals and/or experimental continuing education programs. Two programs supporting training at Schools of Public Health have been included in the study because those Schools often require work experience prior to acceptance for an academic program.



148

*NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION*

The National Science Foundation funds 11 programs which support continuing education at universities. The major contribution of the Foundation to continuing education is the development of institutes which provide secondary and college teachers an opportunity to learn about recent scientific developments. Focused more on conveying scientific information than on changing teaching practices, these institutes operate both during the summer and on an academic-year basis. The reluctance of the National Science Foundation to become involved in teacher training and the mixed pattern of success of these institutes are discussed in the case study cited previously.

*SUMMARY*

A discussion in this study of Federal support for the training of educational personnel claims that the role of Federal administrators has become one of money-giving rather than leadership, because our national tradition asserts strongly that government should only support education and not seek to guide or control it. The case study on Regional Medical Programs describes a similar kind of uneasy relationship between the Federal government and the medical establishment. The enabling legislation gives the program a mandate to "improve generally the quality and enhance the capacity of the health manpower and facilities available to the Nation," but specifies that this improvement is to be accomplished without "interferring with the patterns, or the methods of financing, of patient care or professional practice, or with the administration of hospitals . . . ." *Windows to the Bureaucracy*, the 1971 annual report of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, discusses the lack of a policy framework which could govern the relationships of the National Science Foundation and universities in terms of higher continuing education programs.

If there is a common element among these 95 programs, perhaps it is this inability of the Federal government to articulate and implement the long-range goals which instructional services are to accomplish. Rather, the government funds a wide variety of programs with short-term objectives and shuns attempts at institutional change in either the educational or medical establishments.

*ANALYSIS OF PROGRAMS SUPPORTING RESEARCH APPLICATION*

The recent interest in the term "technology transfer" reflects a concern that the ability of universities to produce new knowledge far exceeds their ability to develop ways of implementing this new knowledge. Reasons for this problem come readily to mind. The skills required to do research differ from those required to persuade practitioners to accept and implement research results. Any implementation of research concerning community problems necessarily involves political activity, and university staff are not always persuaded that this is a proper role for them. In addition, until recently, Federal officials have not stressed the importance of conveying research results to users. Only recently is there a realization that greater emphasis on the "transfer" of knowledge is urgently needed.

Several case studies in this report are relevant to this issue. The discussion of the Cooperative Extension Service (see page 55) suggests that new research developments are more likely to be accepted when the potential user has a voice in determining research priorities and can communicate directly with an agent attached to the research source. Analysis of the experience of the Sea Grant Program (see page 60) confirms this assumption and suggests further that national programs must be sufficiently flexible to meet local needs. The current difficulties of the Regional Medical Program (see page 73) reflect the problems of affecting change in a rigid and highly traditional system and the necessity of relating research priorities to long-range goals for institutional change. Finally, the Institute for Criminal Justice of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (see page 88) neither consults potential users about their needs for research nor disseminates those research results which are available in a systematic fashion. Not unexpectedly, practitioners in the field of criminal justice report that their activities, plans, and operations are unaffected by the Federally funded research in their area.

Clear distinctions cannot be made between those Federally funded programs which focus on instructional services and those which focus on technology transfer or research application.* Instructional programs at universities assume a research or knowledge base, and programs of research application often use various forms of instructional services to convey research results. Forty-eight of the 143 programs reviewed in this study, however, focus more clearly on research application or extension than on instructional services by traditional means. (See Table 9.) Some of these programs have multi-purposes which combine standard training programs and research.

Total Federal expenditures in FY 1970 for these programs were $2,029,573,000. Out of this, an estimated $357,341,000 went to colleges and universities for activities discussed in this section.

*The term research application, rather than technology transfer, will be used in this paper since it encompasses research in the social sciences.

*DISTRIBUTION BY AGENCY*

By agency, programs were distributed as follows:

| *Agency* | *Number* |
|---|---|
| Department of Health, Education and Welfare | 13 |
| Social and Rehabilitation Service (6) | |
| Office of Education (4) | |
| Health Services and Mental Health Administration (2) | |
| Environmental Health Service (1) | |
| Department of Agriculture | 10 |
| Environmental Protection Agency | 5 |
| Department of Interior | 4 |
| Department of Housing and Urban Development | 3 |
| Department of Justice | 3 |
| Office of Economic Opportunity | 3 |
| Department of Commerce | 2 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 2 |
| Department of Labor | 1 |
| National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities | 1 |
| National Science Foundation | 1 |
| | 48 |

*DISTRIBUTION BY PROGRAM PURPOSE*

An analysis of the purposes of these programs is somewhat more revealing than a listing of Federal agencies involved. Not surprisingly, the greatest single effort, both in terms of number of programs and funds, was in the area of agriculture extension. In terms of dollars expended by colleges and universities, the second largest area of concern was the disadvantaged, followed by multi-purpose programs, a category which overlaps considerably with the disadvantaged. The entire distribution is as follows:

*PROGRAM CLIENTELE*

The term "program clientele" applies to the person, institution or group, identified in each of the 143 program descriptions. This term is related to but not synonomous with program purpose. For example, the purpose of two programs may be to serve public health needs. In one program this might be done through fellowships for medical personnel, in which case the clientele would be "health professionals." In the second program, public health purposes might be served through university research application to community needs. In the case of the latter, the clientele would be "universities and colleges."

More than two-thirds of the total funds expended are directed to two groups of clientele, State and local governments and the disadvantaged. Although a large number of programs is intended to benefit colleges and universities, the actual expenditure of funds directly supporting academic institutions is less than 10% of the total.

Since research application encompasses a wide range of activity, the 48 programs were sub-divided into four categories in an attempt to convey more concretely the nature of Federal support: cooperative extension, demonstration programs, primary focus on research and advisory services.

*THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE MODEL*

The Cooperative Extension method is the oldest and most successful means of conveying research results to users. Seventeen of the 48 programs are either funded through the Cooperative Extension structure or one which is similar. Those programs account for a total expenditure of $151,617,000 for extension purposes.

| *Purpose* | *Number* | *Total Federal Expenditure* | *Funds Expended by Colleges and Universities* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Educational Personnel Development | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Public Health | 3 | $ 81,296,000 | $ 43,985,000 |
| Vocational Education | 1 | 25,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| Miscellaneous Education for the General Public | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Veterans Education | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Agricultural Production and Rural Life | 13 | 134,543,000 | 134,543,000 |
| Community Problems: | | | |
| a. Environmental Problems | 10 | 43,135,000 | 24,642,000 |
| b. Problems of the Disadvantaged | 5 | 1,302,116,000 | 82,669,000 |
| c. Crime and Delinquency | 5 | 45,987,000 | 12,896,000 |
| d. Multi-Purpose | 11 | 397,496,000 | 53,606,000 |
| | 48 | $2,029,573,000 | $357,341,000 |

| *Program Clientele* | *Number* | *Total Federal Expenditure* | *Funds Expended by Colleges and Universities* |
|---|---|---|---|
| State and Local Governments | 14 | $ 155,506,000 | $139,254,000 |
| Disadvantaged | 11 | 1,694,895,000 | 133,995,000 |
| Universities and Colleges | 11 | 36,762,000 | 20,951,000 |
| Qualified Professionals | 8 | 64,300,000 | 18,702,000 |
| Health Professionals | 2 | 77,123,000 | 43,453,000 |
| Miscellaneous Categories | 2 | 987,000 | 987,000 |
| | 48 | $2,029,573,000 | $357,342,000 |

Distribution of programs by purpose, clientele and agency is predictable. Four of the 17 extension programs are directed to the improvement of the environment, and the remainder are concerned with agricultural extension. By program clientele, 11 of the programs are directed to State and local governments, four to colleges and universities, and two to the general public. The Department of Agriculture has the largest group of programs, 10, while the Department of Commerce and the Tennessee Valley Authority each has two, and three are funded through the Department of the Interior. Only two of these programs are of recent origin, Sea Grant Project and Sea Grant Institutional Support, and those programs account for less than $9,000,000 in expenditures.

*Distribution by Agency*

| *Agency* | *Number* |
|---|---|
| Department of Health, Education and Welfare | 5 |
| Office of Economic Opportunity | 3 |
| Environmental Protection Agency | 2 |
| Department of Housing and Urban Development | 1 |
| Department of Justice | 1 |
| National Science Foundation | 1 |
| | 13 |

### *DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS AND COMBINED ACTIVITIES*

Thirteen programs stressed university involvement in demonstration projects, experimental efforts, or in programs which combined training and research efforts. The great majority of these programs permitted competition between universities and other non-profit institutions for receipt of funds. An example is the Emergency Food and Medical Services Program, funded through the Office of Economic Opportunity. Five grants and contracts out of 42 were made to universities and colleges for projects ranging from a Statewide nutrition education advertising campaign in New Mexico to a vegetable production co-op in Mississippi. Total Federal expenditures for the 13 programs were $509,311,000; an estimated figure for college and university-based programs was $114,640,000, or slightly more than 20%.

The table on Purpose and Clientele suggests the heavy dependence on universities and colleges to develop solutions for community problems and the disadvantaged. However, in contrast to those programs discussed in the previous section, there seems to be no clear policy governing university involvement and no attempts to develop institutional capability in appropriate areas. Rather, a number of different Federal agencies are involved, and the involvement of colleges and universities is peripheral to the major program purposes in terms of dollars expended.

*Distribution by Purpose and Clientele*

| *Purpose* | *Number* |
|---|---|
| Community Problems | |
| a. Multi-Purpose | 5 |
| b. Problems of the Disadvantaged | 1 |
| c. Environmental Problems | 2 |
| d. Crime and Delinquency | 2 |
| Public Health | 3 |
| | 13 |

| *Clientele* | *Number* |
|---|---|
| The Disadvantaged | 7 |
| Qualified Professionals | 3 |
| Health Professionals | 1 |
| State and Local Governments | 1 |
| Universities and Colleges | 1 |
| | 13 |

*FOCUS ON RESEARCH*

This category of programs is similar to the category previously discussed in that universities and colleges are not the primary recipients of funds dispersed. Total Federal expenditures of the 13 programs in this section were $73,536,000, with an estimated $22,380,000 supporting research in higher education institutions. Programs in this category have some extension components or they relate their research activities to specific community problems.

*Distribution by Agency*

| *Agency* | *Number* |
|---|---|
| Department of Health, Education and Welfare | 3 |
| Department of Housing and Urban Development | 3 |
| Department of Justice | 2 |
| Environmental Protection Agency | 2 |
| Department of Agriculture | 1 |
| Department of Labor | 1 |
| National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities | 1 |
| | 13 |

*Distribution by Program Purpose and Clientele*

| *Purpose* | *Number* |
|---|---|
| Community Problems | |
| a. Multi-Purpose | 5 |
| b. Disadvantaged | 2 |
| c. Environmental Problems | 3 |
| d. Crime and Delinquency | 2 |
| Vocational Education | 1 |
| | 13 |

| *Clientele* | *Number* |
|---|---|
| Universities and Colleges | 6 |
| Qualified Professionals | 5 |
| The Disadvantaged | 1 |
| Health Professionals | 1 |
| | 13 |

*ADVISORY SERVICES*

Finally, there are a number of programs which make only minimal use of the resources of colleges and universities. In these cases, universities are used primarily for evaluation of larger programs or to perform other limited advisory services. Total Federal expenditures on these five programs were $1,295,109,000, with an estimated $68,705,000 supporting activities carried on by colleges and universities. By agency, four of these programs were funded through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and one was funded through the Environmental Protection Agency. By purpose, all were concerned with community problems. The clientele of three of the programs was the disadvantaged, and two served State and local governments.

*SUMMARY*

A recurrent theme of this study has been the lack of overall policy governing the relationships between the Federal Government and the university. This lack of policy is most clearly evident in an analysis of programs concerned with research application. Slightly less than half of the total figure for research application is spent on programs which operate through the Cooperating Extension structure, the most successful American method developed for conveying research results to users. However, only two of the programs of that total are of recent origin and none is oriented toward the disadvantaged or urban problems, two areas of immediate concern.

Instead there is a proliferation of programs operated through a wide variety of Government agencies, many of which grant funds for demonstration projects which have no sequels or which fund research efforts which have only minimal impact on potential users. Few of these programs exhibit a commitment to developing institutional capacity to transmit research results or a focus on the special problems of extension. □

**Table 8. Analysis of Instructional Service Programs (95) by Program Purpose**

## PROGRAM ADDRESSED TO: EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT (36)

AGENCY: *Department of Health, Education and Welfare (23)*

Office of Education (22)

PROGRAM:
- Adult Basic Education
- Civil Rights Technical Assistance and Training
- Educational Classroom Personnel Training – Basic Studies
- Educational Classroom Personnel Training – Special Education (Handicapped)
- Educational Personnel Training Grants – Career Opportunities
- Educational Personnel Training – Drug Abuse Education
- Educational Classroom Personnel Training: Early Childhood
- Educational Personnel Development – Media Specialists Program
- Educational Personnel Development – Pupil Personnel Specialists
- Educational Staff Training – School Personnel Utilization
- Educational Staff Training – Teacher Leadership Development
- Educational Classroom Personnel Training – Teacher Development for Desegregating Schools
- Educationally Deprived Children – Handicapped
- Educationally Deprived Children in Institutions for Neglected or Delinquent Children
- Handicapped Physical Education and Recreation Training
- Handicapped Teacher Education
- Higher Education Personnel Development – Institutes, Short-term Training Programs
- Pre-School Elementary and Secondary Personnel Development – Grants to States
- Teacher Corps – Operations and Training
- Training of Teacher Trainers
- Vocational Education Personnel Development Awards
- Vocational Education Personnel Development – Professional Personnel Development for States

Social and Rehabilitation Service (1)

- Child Welfare Training

AGENCY: *Atomic Energy Commission (4)*

PROGRAM:
- Nuclear Education and Training – Faculty Research Participation
- Nuclear Education and Training – Faculty Student Conferences
- Nuclear Education and Training – Faculty Training Institutes
- Nuclear Education and Training – Faculty Workshops

AGENCY: *National Science Foundation (9)*

PROGRAM:
- Academic Year Institutes for Secondary School Teachers
- Advanced Training Projects (Advanced Science Education Program)
- Cooperative College School Science Program
- Cooperative Projects for Two-Year Colleges
- In-Service Institute for Secondary School Teachers
- Research Participation for College Teachers
- Short Courses for College Teachers
- Summer Institutes for College Teachers
- Summer Institutes and Short Courses for Secondary School Teachers

## PROGRAM ADDRESSED TO: PUBLIC HEALTH (PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES) (19)

AGENCY: *Department of Health, Education and Welfare (18)*

Health Services and Mental Health Administration (4)

PROGRAM:
- Comprehensive Health Planning – Training, Studies and Demonstration
- Mental Health Fellowships
- Health Services Research and Development – Fellowships and Training
- Mental Health Training Grants

National Institutes of Health (14)

- Allied Health Professions Development Grants
- Child Health and Human Development – Fellowships
- Communicable Diseases – Training Public Health Workers
- Dental Health Continuing Education Training Grants

Dental Health Fellowships
Dental Health Research Grants
General Medical Sciences – Fellowships
Nurse Traineeships
Nurse Training – Special Project Grants
Occupational Safety and Health Training Grants
Project Grants for Public Health Training
Public Health Traineeship Grants
Special Fellowships in Nursing Research
Nursing Research Training Grants

AGENCY: *Office of Economic Opportunity (1)*
PROGRAM: Comprehensive Health Services

## PROGRAM ADDRESSED TO: VOCATIONAL EDUCATION (7)

AGENCY: *Department of Health Education and Welfare (5)*
National Institutes of Health (1)
PROGRAM: Physician and Allied Health Manpower Research Grants

Office of Education (2)
Library Training Grants
Vocational Education – Consumer and Homemaking

Social and Rehabilitation Service (2)
New Career Opportunities for the Handicapped
New Career Opportunities in Vocational Rehabilitation

AGENCY: *Environmental Protection Agency (1)*
PROGRAM: Radiological Health Training Grants

AGENCY: *Office of Economic Opportunity (1)*
PROGRAM: Alcoholism Counseling and Recovery (Training and Technical Assistance)

## PROGRAM ADDRESSED TO: MISCELLANEOUS EDUCATION FOR THE GENERAL PUBLIC (9)

AGENCY: *Department of Defense (1)*
PROGRAM: Civil Defense – Training and Education

AGENCY: *Department of Health Education and Welfare (2)*
Office of Education (1)
PROGRAM: Educational Broadcasting Facilities

Health Services and Mental Health Administration (1)
Emergency Health – Community Preparedness

AGENCY: *Atomic Energy Commission (3)*
PROGRAM: Nuclear Education and Training – Operation of Courses, Oak Ridge Associated Universities
Nuclear Materials Safeguards Training
Uranium Industry Workshops

AGENCY: *National Endowment for the Arts (1)*
PROGRAM: Promotion of the Arts – State and Community Operations

AGENCY: *National Endowment for the Humanities (1)*
PROGRAM: Promotion of the Humanities – Public Programs

AGENCY: *National Science Foundation (1)*
PROGRAM: Public Understanding of Science

## PROGRAM ADDRESSED TO: VETERAN'S EDUCATION (3)

AGENCY: *Veterans Administration (3)*
PROGRAM: Dependents' Educational Assistance
Veterans Educational Assistance
Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Veterans

## PROGRAM ADDRESSED TO: COMMUNITY PROBLEMS – ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS (5)

AGENCY: *Department of Health, Education and Welfare (3)*
Environmental Health Service (1)
PROGRAM: Community Environmental Management Training Grants

National Institutes of Health (2)
Environmental Health Sciences – Fellowships and Research Career Development Awards
Environmental Health Sciences – Training Grants

AGENCY: *Environmental Protection Agency (2)*
PROGRAM: Water Pollution Control Research Fellowships
Water Pollution Control Training Grants

## PROGRAM ADDRESSED TO: COMMUNITY PROBLEMS – PROBLEMS OF THE DISADVANTAGED (5)

AGENCY: *Department of Health, Education and Welfare (3)*

Office of Education (1)

PROGRAM: Follow Through

Social and Rehabilitation Service (2)

Public Assistance Staff Development – Formula Grants to States

Rehabilitation Training

AGENCY: *Department of Labor (1)*

PROGRAM: Public Service Careers

AGENCY: *Office of Economic Opportunity (1)*

PROGRAM: Legal Services

## PROGRAM ADDRESSED TO: COMMUNITY PROBLEMS – CRIME AND DELINQUENCY (4)

AGENCY: *Department of Health, Education and Welfare (3)*

Social and Rehabilitation Service (3)

PROGRAM: Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control – Model Programs and Technical Assistance

Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control – Training

Juvenile Delinquency Planning, Prevention and Rehabilitation

AGENCY: *Department of Justice (1)*

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (1)

PROGRAM: Law Enforcement Education Program – Student Financial Aid

## PROGRAM ADDRESSED TO: COMMUNITY PROBLEMS – MULTI-PURPOSE (7)

AGENCY: *Department of Health, Education and Welfare (2)*

Office of Education (1)

PROGRAM: Community Service and Continuing Education

Social and Rehabilitation Service (1)

Aging – Grants for State and Community Programs on Aging

AGENCY: *Department of Housing and Urban Development (3)*

PROGRAM: Comprehensive Planning Assistance
Community Development Training Grants
City Planning and Urban Studies Fellowships

AGENCY: *Department of Transportation (1)*

PROGRAM: Urban Mass Transportation Managerial Training Grants

AGENCY: *National Science Foundation (1)*

PROGRAM: Post-doctoral and Senior Post-doctoral Fellowships

**Table 9. Analysis of Research Application Programs (48) by Program Purpose**

## PROGRAM ADDRESSED TO: PUBLIC HEALTH (PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES) (3)

AGENCY: *Department of Health, Education and Welfare (1)*

Health Services and Mental Health Administration (1)

PROGRAM: Regional Medical Programs – Operational and Planning Grants

AGENCY: *Office of Economic Opportunity (2)*

PROGRAM: Emergency Food and Medical Services
Family Planning

## PROGRAM ADDRESSED TO: VOCATIONAL EDUCATION (1)

AGENCY: *Department of Labor (1)*

PROGRAM: Research and Development Program

## PROGRAM ADDRESSED TO: AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION AND RURAL LIFE (13)

AGENCY: *Department of Agriculture (10)*

PROGRAM: Expanded Food and Nutrition Program
Extension Programs for Assisting in Community Development
Extension Programs for Forestry Production and Marketing
Extension Programs for Improved Family Living
Extension Programs for Improved Farm Income
Extension Programs for Marketing and Distribution
Extension Programs for Pesticides Safety and Rural Civil Defense
Extension Programs for Recreation, Wildlife and Natural Beauty
Extension Programs for Soil and Water Conservation
Four-H – Youth Development

AGENCY: *Department of Interior (1)*

PROGRAM: Agricultural Extension Services

AGENCY: *Tennessee Valley Authority (2)*

PROGRAM: Agricultural Development in the Tennessee Valley
Fertilizer Introduction – Farm Test Demonstration

## PROGRAM ADDRESSED TO: COMMUNITY PROBLEMS – ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS (10)

AGENCY: *Department of Commerce (2)*

PROGRAM: Sea Grant Institutional Support
Sea Grant Project Support

AGENCY: *Department of Health, Education and Welfare (1)*

PROGRAM: Community Environmental Management Research Grants

AGENCY: *Department of Interior (2)*

PROGRAM: Water Resources Research – Assistance to States for Institutes
Water Resources Research – Matching Grants to State Institutes

AGENCY: *Environmental Protection Agency (5)*

PROGRAM: Air Pollution Research Grants
Air Pollution Survey and Demonstration Grants
Solid Waste Demonstration Grants
Solid Waste Research Grants
Water Pollution Control, State and Interstate Program Grants

## PROGRAM ADDRESSED TO: COMMUNITY PROBLEMS – THE DISADVANTAGED (5)

AGENCY: *Department of Health, Education and Welfare (5)*

Office of Education (4)

PROGRAM: Adult Basic Education – Special Projects
Educationally Deprived Children – Local Educational Agencies
Educationally Deprived Children – Migrants
Handicapped Physical Education and Recreation Research

Social and Rehabilitation Services (1)

Rehabilitation Research and Demonstration Grants

## PROGRAM ADDRESSED TO: COMMUNITY PROBLEMS – CRIME AND DELINQUENCY (5)

AGENCY: *Department of Justice (5)*

PROGRAM: Law Enforcement Assistance Discretionary Grants
Law Enforcement Assistance – Improving and Strengthening Law Enforcement
Law Enforcement Research and Development – Pilot Grants
Law Enforcement Research and Development – Project Grants
Law Enforcement Research and Development – Visiting Fellowships

## PROGRAM ADDRESSED TO: COMMUNITY PROBLEMS – MULTI-PURPOSE (11)

AGENCY: *Department of Health, Education and Welfare (4)*

Health Services and Mental Health Administration (1)

PROGRAM: Nutrition

Social and Rehabilitation Service (3)

Aging – Research and Demonstration Grants
Child Welfare Research and Demonstration Grants
Rehabilitation Research and Training Grants

AGENCY: *Department of Housing and Urban Development (3)*

PROGRAM: Comprehensive Planning Research and Demonstration
Model Cities Supplementary Grants
Urban Renewal Demonstration Programs

AGENCY: *Department of Interior (1)*

PROGRAM: Cooperative Research Program

AGENCY: *National Endowment for the Arts (1)*

PROGRAM: Promotion of the Arts – Architecture, Planning and Design

AGENCY: *National Science Foundation (1)*

PROGRAM: Intergovernmental Science Program

AGENCY: *Office of Economic Opportunity (1)*

PROGRAM: Planning, Research, Evaluation and Program Development

# PART II

## EXAMINATION OF SPECIFIC PROGRAMS AND AREAS OF PROGRAM CONCENTRATION

# INTRODUCTION

With the staff and financial resources available, a thorough review of each of the 143 programs on which data were gathered was beyond our means. Consequently, reviews in depth were made only on a selective basis, through a series of case studies.

The approach and methodology in these case studies vary. Some cases present concrete and explicit detail about the operation of a particular program at a given university; others trace the historical development of the government's support of a social goal; and some consider broad issues of program formulation and administration.

In choosing programs and program areas for more detailed inquiry, we were guided by several criteria: (1) the size of the program or program area within the total Federal effort in extension and continuing education; (2) the extent to which a program represents an important attempt to use higher continuing education resources to serve national objectives; (3) the need to select programs addressed to a variety of different societal purposes, and (4) the need to examine differing forms of funding, organization and program administration.

In line with these criteria, we selected for more detailed examination nine programs or program areas which are representative of most of the 143 programs included in our review.

For example, 36 programs deal with the program area of professional development of teachers. Here we sought to treat continuing education for teachers as a single objective, comprised of multiple programs established at different times for varying purposes.

Educational programs for veterans are of both historic and current importance; therefore the operation by the Veterans Administration of the three programs which comprise the "G.I.Bill" was selected for intensive examination.

Similarly, Agricultural Extension was the forerunner of Federally funded continuing education activity and has shaped the development of the American university in unique and significant ways; hence a study of the ten programs of the Cooperative Extension Service is included. This case study seeks to convey the magnitude, diversity and coordination of effort involved in Cooperative Extension and its relevance to American society today.

Twenty-three individual programs concentrate on continuing education and training for persons in medicine and public health. The range and variety of these programs are such that they do not lend themselves to a consolidated scheme of analysis. Consequently, we selected one major, representative program within the health field (Regional Medical Program) for thorough review and analysis.

Similarly, we were interested in new programs which seek to develop workable models which combine a sophisticated scientific research effort with the means for extending this research to the public at large or to a special clientele. As a result, a case study of the Sea Grant Program was made.

Ten programs serve the disadvantaged directly or indirectly. Among these we selected for detailed study the Legal Services Program which uses universities in an operational role as agents of social change. The difficulties involved in such use of university resources apply also to a variety of other programs in which political sensitivity and the value-laden nature of the university's involvement create special problems and raise important questions.

Among the various programs included in this study are nine which deal with crime and delinquency. The largest and most important of these is the Law Enforcement Assistance Act which seeks to draw upon university resources in important, supportive ways; hence a study of the operation of this Act, focusing on university involvement, is included.

In view of this Council's explicit statutory relationship to the Community Services Program established under Title I of the Higher Education Act, and also because this program exemplifies the kinds of university involvement with which our whole study deals, we have given separate focus and treatment to this key program. And finally, we have given some specific attention and focus to those eleven

Federally supported continuing education programs operated directly by Federal agencies, rather than through universities.

Throughout the text, we have concentrated on describing what exists and on identifying major issues and problems in ways which might provide a basis from which to draw conclusions and upon which to make recommendations. For the most part, however, we have consciously refrained from including within the narrative specific recommendations for changes in law, policy or practice. □

# COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

The Cooperative Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture was founded in 1914. The circumstances which made its beginning possible, however, might be traced further back to 1862, when the Congress enacted into law two bills which were to affect profoundly American education and American life. Despite the immediacy of the Civil War, Congress assured the long-term needs of the nation, first, by the passage of the Morrill Act, and second, by passage of a bill which established the Department of Agriculture.

The Morrill Act and what it set in motion is a familiar story to American educators. To this day the Act is considered a seminal effort on the part of the Federal government to establish a policy toward higher education. By releasing to the States large tracts of the public domain for the establishment of agricultural and mechanical schools, the Morrill Act underscored the central role that the States would play in the administration of educational activities, and the Federal government's obligation to support such a role.

Provisions were made for at least one such institution in each State. In 1890 the Act was amended to provide funds for each of these institutions, and to provide funds also to the so-called 1890 colleges–sixteen predominantly black colleges plus Tuskegee Institute. (Federal City College in Washington, D. C. was subsequently added to this list.)

These "land grant" colleges are a unique American expression of a determination to use knowledge for practical ends. From the beginning, it was understood by all that these colleges would not be like the largely private, sectarian and traditionally oriented schools that then dominated American higher education. These colleges would be technically and vocationally oriented, and would address themselves to the problems of the present. They would seek to provide basic occupational services to the States and communities and, in so doing, open the doors of higher education for the first time to the sons and daughters of the working classes.

The land grant colleges offered a service. That service was an attempt to apply the "useful and practical information" developed at the State experimental stations to problems which were of concern to individuals and communities. At the time these developments were occurring, America was essentially an agricultural and rural society, and Americans a largely farm-oriented people. It is not surprising, therefore, that when a major breakthrough occurred involving a sound method of extension education, the method involved the coupling of resources by the Federal Department of Agriculture, the States and the land grant colleges.

The Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture evolved in the Smith-Lever Act as a response to the urgent problems created by an inefficient and underproductive agricultural industry and an underdeveloped rural life. It responded also to the legitimate needs of the nation's single largest group of under-privileged citizens: the farmers, their families and their communities.

A key to the success of this experiment is the voluntary cooperation of those who participate in it. Little effort is made to pressure the farmer or the rural communities into accepting this or that agricultural practice. In keeping with a history of voluntary cooperation, propagation is by practical instruction, persuasion and demonstration. If it can be demonstrated to the farmer that one means of cultivation is superior and more profitable than another, that, it is felt, is all that can reasonably be done to convince him that it is in his own best interests to adopt such a practice. This assumption applies also to homemakers, youth programs, community activities and the rural industries and consumers.

Money, privilege and prestige are not used as inducements in the Cooperative Extension Service. Practical knowledge is. Because the effectiveness of the information the farmers and others sought could be demonstrated to them, and because also there was a relatively minimal gap between the time the educational process began and when it paid off, the Extension Services' "delivery system" was

quick to establish a wide credibility among rural individuals and communities.

The Service has another considerable advantage working to its benefit. It is apolitical. The Service has traditionally been successful in removing itself from politics and partisanship. This is possible for two reasons: first, Congress identified the land grant universities and not political units of the State governments as the centers for extension activities; and, second, a highly effective method was chosen to channel funds to these institutions.

By tying the Extension Service to the university, the Congress wisely separated it from the uncertainties of partisan politics, and guaranteed to it the stability of the university environment and the proximity the Service needed to the resources upon which its entire effort depended.

Of equal importance to the choice of location for the Cooperative Extension Service was the means established to fund it. The means selected is called "formula granting," a popular method of funding by which many ongoing programs of the Federal government are supported. In the case of the Extension Service, the formula is based on the following: the base amount of what is available, plus whatever increases are allocated in a given year, distributed as follows: 4% reserved for the administration of the program and the provision of technical assistance to the States; 20% distributed to each State in equal amounts; 40% to each State according to its farm population; and the remaining amounts to each State according to its rural population (i.e., communities with less than 2,500 population).

The Congress may occasionally stipulate that certain dollar contributions to the program initiated by the Federal government should be matched in dollars or services by the States. As a consequence, it has been estimated that in recent years the annual Federal contribution to the regular ongoing programs has been averaging approximately 40%, with an additional 40% contributed by the State governments, and the remaining 20% contributed primarily by country governments.

In FY 1970, for instance, the Federal contribution to the program amounted to $112,720,000, or 39% of the total expenditure. Dollars contributed from within-State sources amounted to $178,000,000, of which $119,115,000, or 41%, was appropriated by the State governments.

The formula grant process has many advantages over the more common "project grant" method of funding programs. The major advantage of the formula grant process is the guarantee it provides for funding on a long-term basis. In the case of the Extension Service, funds are released to the States upon annual submission and approval of State Plans. With the exception of occasions where there are major changes in State Plans, these Plans do not have to be approved again in order for any State to receive funds during any subsequent fiscal year.

Because a certain level of funding is assured over an extended period of time, both long- and short-term objectives can be identified; planning activities can take place accordingly; extension and university staffing can develop on a more stable basis; and, in general, the Service can operate with the assurance that there stands behind it the dollar support of the Federal, State and local governments.

Another key to the effectiveness of the Extension Service is the mechanism which was developed to administer it. On paper this mechanism, or "delivery system," appears well-structured and simple. In real terms, however, the system involves a massive effort to educate millions of Americans outside the traditional confines of the university. It combines the resources of Federal and State governments and the land grant universities in a comprehensive approach to a solution of local and regional problems. The undertaking itself rests on the cooperation of all those who participate in it. Without the cooperation of these thousands of unpaid volunteers, it is inconceivable that the Cooperative Extension Service could ever have succeeded in rallying the resources it has to solve individual and community problems.

The Federal contribution to the Service is large in terms of dollars and small in terms of staff. In FY 1970 the national office consisted of about one hundred professional employees. This staff has two main functions: first, to provide the only coordinating unit to the nationwide extension effort; and, second, to provide to those individuals cooperating in the program technical and management information that will assist them in the administration of State and local programs.

The staff is divided into the four basic program units of the Extension Service: Agriculture and Natural Resources; Community (Rural) Resources Development; 4-H Youth programs; and Home Economics. A fifth unit is the Office of International Extension, funded by the Agency for International Development, which carries out the United States' assistance to extension services in other countries.

The national office staff does not provide subject matter information to the field. This information is available more readily at the local and regional level, where county and area agents have direct access to the university-based research centers. What the national office does provide is the kind of current information that results from having an overview of State programs and projects, and from the unit's visibility and recognition as a central source and distributor of information about extension activities. Together these allow the national office to initiate the kinds of national programs that are essential in helping the States to establish flexible program-building efforts in a variety of circumstances.

The full dimensions of extension activity, however, are more clearly evident at the local and regional levels. There, 16,000 professional workers, 10,000 support staff, 11,000 program aides (for the new nutrition program), and over one million unpaid volunteers cooperate in implementing the objectives of the Extension Service.

The historical key to this network of manpower is the county agent. In FY 1970 there were approximately 16,000 of these agents operating in virtually every county in the nation. These agents work in three-man units, with each unit consisting generally of an agriculturist, a home economist and a youth worker. In the past, the agent's primary role was that of teacher and catalyst. In this way he carried out the function of the Extension Service as the educational arm of the Department of Agriculture. His task was to bring to the farmer, related industries, or the individual living in the rural area, the information needed to operate more efficiently and profitably. In turn, the accumulation of information that the agent received was instrumental in helping the agent define his educational role, identify and clarify new problem areas, and relay this information to other agents and State extension directors and to State-wide, university-based, subject-matter specialists.

The role of the county agent has changed substantially in recent years. The change has occurred for several reasons, but mainly because the agents no longer have the training and ability to handle the increasingly complex information that is available to them. In addition, agricultural practices are becoming more sophisticated and multi-disciplinary; agricultural and community problems are more regional in nature; and solutions to these problems less easily demonstrated. The sheer bulk of this information raises the question, consequently, of not only the education of the county agent but more importantly the question of his reeducation.

Because the county agent no longer has readily at hand the kinds of special information needed to service local needs, adjustments have been made within the structure of the Extension Service to put the county agent in touch with those individuals who do. Consequently, as the county agent becomes more of a generalist in his distribution of information, he is joined in his efforts by a second group of individuals who are specialists.

These subject matter specialists are individuals associated with the State extension services and the land grant universities. Together, these individuals comprise a relatively new group of men on the Cooperative Extension Service called "area agents." In effect, what these new area agents are doing is cooperating with the county agents in providing more immediate assistance to the solution of relevant problems.

To adjust to this fact, the county agent's role has altered appreciably. He remains central to the effective operation of the Extension Service, but central to it in a new way. Whereas he was once identified as the primary teacher, he is now also identified as the "contact" man—the program leader who establishes initial contact with individuals and groups, identifies critical areas of concern, and who then provides the occasion whereby the knowledge of the area agents and specialists can be applied to partial or whole solution of those areas of concern.

The county agent is changing in another way as well. In the past, the typical county agent would likely have had a background in home economics or agriculture. Today, however, the newer breed of county agent has a stronger background in management, economics, public administration and the political and social sciences. These disciplines reflect both the shifting priorities of the Extension Service and the constant need to retrain agents and specialists and provide them with more current information. The pressure for retraining is constant and results in more advanced academic degrees and broader educational backgrounds.

Salaries for the county agents are established by the individual States. In FY 1970, the range of salaries extended from a high in California of $19,300 to lows of $7,690 in Puerto Rico and $10,190 in Montana respectively. In addition to the disparity of salaries (much of which is justified by geographic considerations) and the comparatively low level of financial rewards, a considerable number of agents are additionally subject to low professional regard among full-time academic personnel at the university, among whom it is common to disregard other than clearly academic achievements.

Professional recognition is one concern; professional advancement is another. "Upward mobility" is as much a concern among agents and others working in extension as it is among those outside the field. Unfortunately for the agent, the two institutions with which he works most closely—the university and the State government—do not have the kinds and number of vacancies that would allow for his systematic promotion. Emphasis, therefore, is on retraining the agent for the same responsibilities rather than retraining him for new responsibilities. Some professional advancement is available, however, through the opportunities provided to extension staff in industry, business and organizations related to agriculture and natural resources.

Regardless of the professional abrasions which may affect them, the county and area agents remain the foundation upon which so much in the Extension Service depends. The series of contacts, of personal exchanges, which characterize their roles contributes to extension work the same elements of personal trust and confidence that characterize other more esteemed professions.

It is this strain of "personalism" that offers the program a degree of credibility among its users that is difficult to replace, either by machines, computers or the mass media. In addition to knowing *what* information is needed or shared, the individual cooperating in the program has the advantage of knowing from *whom* he is receiving it.

An indication of the success of this basic approach is evident in the nutrition program which has been initiated within the Extension Service. The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program is designed to improve the dietary habits of low-income families, with a particular emphasis on reaching the low-income minority groups living in urban (but non-metropolitan) areas.

There are several unique aspects of this program which should be noted. First, the program moves the Extension Service systematically into the urban centers of the nation. Although it is true that the Extension Service

has always had some ongoing activities in urban areas, as a rule these activities were limited. Second, the program for the first time involves agents in a substantial way in the training and use of sub-professionals. And third, the program represents still another opportunity to explore and to stimulate the use of adults and youth volunteers in all phases of the program.

The use of indigenous populations in the urban areas as aides in the program is a major factor in its implementation. It is unlikely that university staff would ever receive the same kind of reception by inner-city families that these aides do. The aides, of whom there are about 10,000, usually have had a minimal education themselves. They are recruited through schools, churches, community centers and community leaders. Each aide receives an initial three-week training course in food preparation, cooking, nutrition and teaching, and is then assigned a list of families with whom he or she will work. The county agent works closely with local health departments, social welfare agencies and Social Security offices in identifying these families.

As is true in all other extension activities of the Service, participation in the program is voluntary. It was started at the Federal level in November of 1969 with an appropriation of $28,000,000, since increased to $50,000,000. It evolved from an earlier 1960 Presidential Task Force on Nutrition and was tested and demonstrated for five years in Alabama.

In a way, this nutrition effort can be seen as a major new thrust of the Extension Service. It can also be seen as a throwback to the way the Service has been operating for years: the use of individuals operating on a cooperative and person-to-person basis in the distribution and voluntary acceptance of needed information. In short, the program is a convincing indication that the Extension Service is still able to respond to new challenges with tested methods.

Specialization is not as much of an issue with the Expanded Food and Nutrition Program as it is with other programs. One consequence of this trend toward specialization, however, is the increased use it requires of university-based extension specialists and researchers who are frequently on split appointments. This specialization is already evident in the evolution of the area agents. It is also evident in the more extensive use made of other colleges and departments of the universities, and in the more complex research these universities are called upon to provide.

The university's major role in the Extension Service is to provide a research base for it. Most of this research is carried on at the one or more experimental field stations which are attached to each land grant university and operate in cooperation with the U. S. Department of Agriculture. These field stations are physically detached from the university and are conveniently located among the communities of the State. In addition, the research laboratories of the Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, the Forest Service and other U.S.D.A. research efforts are located throughout the States and cooperate closely with State research activities.

The question which these field stations must routinely confront is: Is the research carried on by the university the same research that is needed by the community? And, how are research priorities established?

There are those who charge that, since the field stations belong to the universities, first consideration should be given to the research needs of the university. Others insist that these field stations are engaged in too much basic research and too little applied research. There are those who say that it takes too long to transmit the by-products of this research to the potential users, and that when the transmittal occurs, it occurs in language which is too technical. And, finally, there are those who charge that the research priorities reflect less and less the needs of the small farmer and more and more the requirements of agro-business industries and the commercial farmers.

The question of research priorities is a critical one for the Cooperative Extension Service. Fortunately there exist several methods for the exchange of information leading to the formulation of such priorities. First, of course, is the routine contacts the county and area agents have with individuals and communities. Both of these agents work closely with the local advisory and planning councils. These councils are comprised of local small and commercial farmers, agricultural business leaders, community leaders, homemakers and others. A similar advisory and policy council exists at the State level.

Through formal and informal exchanges between them and also through exchanges between the agents and the State extension director, these councils are an effective way of relaying from the local to the State level those problem areas which are of current concern. In addition, the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) has been established to provide means by which representatives of the State extension directors (three directors from each of four geographic regions) can confer periodically with the Administrator of the Extension Service and his staff. Recently the composition of this twelve-man committee has been changed to allow broader representation of State personnel other than State extension directors.

In keeping with the Service's history of objectivity and voluntary cooperation, there exists no strict means other than Congressional ear-marking of funds to implement national priorities. Emphasis is placed upon persuasion and demonstration. The decision is left to the States and communities as to whether it would be to their advantage to adopt and implement national priorities.

The universities respond to these priorities primarily through their agricultural colleges and, on frequent occasions, through their colleges of forestry and home economics. More important to the universities at the present time is the increasing involvement of academic resources outside these colleges, a tendency which reflects the expanding nature of extension programs. There is increasing demand for information concerning sound management practices, better economic and business policies, and an increasing use of social and political



1964

scientists in the solution of rural and farm problems. In short, the extension staff at the university now has less direct access to the desired academic resources than it has had in the past.

The question, therefore, is whether the agricultural and home economics colleges, as they are presently composed, can continue to respond effectively to the shifting priorities of the Extension Service.

Another consequence of these shifting priorities is the role that individual decision-making has played in the Service. Programs are being regionalized; the commercial farmer is replacing the small farmer; recommended practices are increasingly multi-purpose and multi-disciplinary; and community problems are becoming even more difficult to resolve. As a result, individual decision making, even though basic to all activities, is of less consequence than it once was. More so than ever before, the decisions which are vital to communities are being made by larger and larger groups of individuals.

The Extension Service has the advantage of experience in adjusting to these realities. There is no doubt it has considerable grass roots support for its activities. It also has access to local and State advisory councils and the cooperation of Federal, State and university staff. Together these represent a formidable network of communication and cooperation.

But there are many grave questions facing the Cooperative Extension Service which will tax it and test how far it can bend in adjusting to new responsibilities. Should it continue to assist the commercial farmer or should it continue to assist the small farmer? Should it do less for both by concentrating on making greater efforts to cooperate with agricultural industrial interests in bringing about sweeping changes to benefit all? Do the agricultural colleges still have sufficient resources to respond to rural problems? Are national priorities consistent with State and local priorities? Does the Extension Service have a responsibility to the huge number of farmers who are "out-migrating" from the farm and rural areas? To the extent that such families are moving to the urban areas, are these the people in the urban areas to whom the Extension Service should address itself rather than to the low-income minority families? And insofar as the Service engages substantially in urban work for the first time, can it convincingly divorce the nutrition program from all those other turbulent problems that affect and destroy the quality of our urban life?

The Extension Service has a history of practice. It does not have a history of activism. Indeed, it has often indicated that it only responds to local and State needs. Because the core of its program is safely protected by the sanctuaries provided by the universities, the Service exults in its objectivity and neutrality toward the problems it seeks to confront.

Despite this neutral approach, critics maintain that the Service itself is basically an Establishment-oriented institution. It represents the middle-class virtures of a middle-class rural population. It abhors controversy.

In the past, the information the Extension Service has disseminated to the public has been highly technical in nature—the appropriate product of scientific laboratories and field stations. As the Service becomes increasingly complex, however, and as it moves toward a more substantial involvement with urban affairs, do the problems of the past remain as technical as they once were, or do they too change? The service has a laudable history of service to individuals. Can it respond likewise to groups and communities in the same fashion, or does it run the risk of continuing to provide largely technical responses to problems which cut closely to the edges of human emotions, expectations, apprehensions and suspicions?

If these are legitimate questions to ask, and if these questions give rise to various problems, the past record of the Cooperative Extension Service would indicate that the questions can be answered and the problems solved. Cooperative Extension has unparalleled resources. It has the full support of Federal, State and local government agencies and of the land grant universities. What is more important, it has attracted the support of millions of individuals who have voluntarily cooperated with the Service and who have benefitted from it.

Cooperative Extension has established a unique and unduplicated system to relay and expand "useful knowledge." It is a system that has worked historically and has given convincing evidence that it can adjust to contemporary needs. Despite the immense size of the program, Cooperative Extension has also shown that a government which collects revenues efficiently can efficiently disperse them as well. It is difficult to believe that the program would have had the success it has had if Congress had chosen anything other that the "formula grants" method to fund it.

Cooperative Extension has credibility at a time when other Federally supported programs leave people incredulous. Its voluntary, apolitical and objective approach to the solution of problems, and the very personal manner in which this approach occurs, has won for the Service considerable individual and community support. It is, after all, unusual to have the Federal, State and local governments and the universities represented to the public by a single person—an agent—whose name is known. □

Ag 65

# NATIONAL SEA GRANT PROGRAM: TWO APPROACHES TO EXTENSION SERVICES

The product of universities is knowledge. How to bring this knowledge to the community in a form which is responsive and relevant is the basic problem of community service programs. Numerous and complicated questions confront the university which attempts to use its resources to explore national issues and to provide communities with the means of solving local problems. What administrative structures best promote the flow of knowledge from researchers to users and encourage inter-disciplinary research? What techniques are most effective in marketing knowledge? How can the three functions of a university—teaching, research, and community services—be effectively coordinated? What special assets does the university have in terms of providing community services?

With a nominal budget of slightly less than $9,000,000 in FY 1970, the National Sea Grant Program has attempted to deal with these questions by promoting inter-disciplinary research on marine affairs; combining research, teaching and advisory services in each university program; and experimenting with new ways of bringing research results to users. The successes and problems of this program provide valuable data for an analysis of the most effective ways universities can provide community services.

Sea Grant Project and Institutional Support Programs represent two of 15 Federal programs which fund continuing and extension education activities relevant to environmental problems. During FY 70, these 15 programs accounted for a total Federal expenditure of $52,530,000. Of the 143 programs reviewed in this study, only these two are funded through the Department of Commerce.

The National Sea Grant Program Act,signed by the President in October 1966, contains both old and new elements. The name was intended to suggest a parallel with the Morrill Act of 1862 which involved universities in the development of the land and established the concept of public service as a role of the American university. Sea Grant differs from the agricultural extension model in its emphasis on the development of marine resources, the combination of formula and project funding, and the wide variety in advisory service programs.

Institutions are eligible for four different kinds of Sea Grant support: Sea Grant Project Support, Coherent Area Project Support, Sea Grant Institutional Support, and designation as a Sea College. Four universities were designated as Sea Colleges in September 1971. Ten universities were receiving over $6,900,000 in institutional support; 10 Coherent Area Projects were funded at $2,600,000, and 33 universities have project grants totaling $3,300,000 in FY 1971. Designation as a Sea College requires a major commitment by the institution to marine affairs and demonstrated excellence as a recipient of institutional support. Project support and Coherent Area Project support often precede institutional support and can be used as criteria for recipient of Sea Grant institutional funds. The net result is a program which combines the institutional flexibility characteristic of formula grants with the Federal control over program direction which project grants provide.

The initiation of the Sea Grant program preceded by approximately two years the publication of *Our Nation and the Sea,* the report of the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources. Charged with the responsibility of formulating a comprehensive, long-term national program for marine affairs, the Commission made a number of recommendations which were important in shaping the future direction of the Sea Grant Program. Primary among these recommendations was the suggestion that a major new civilian agency be established, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency, which would be the principal instrumentality within the Federal government for the Administration of civil marine and atmospheric programs. In 1970, NOAA was established, although as an administration within the Department of Commerce. The Sea Grant Program was subsequently transferred to NOAA from the National Science Foundation. Equally important was the citation of the Sea Grant Program as a vehicle for support of broad-based multi-disciplinary programs and for training from the technician to the post-doctoral level in all areas related to marine activities.

The program has three major components: research, graduate education and technician training, and advisory services. Research money can more quickly be absorbed into the current structure of most non-land grant universities than can funds for advisory services which may require new administrative structures and a reorientation in university goals. In addition, it is necessary to develop a body of knowledge before effective extension activities can be undertaken.

An analysis of the Sea Grant Program through April 1, 1971 confirms this university focus on research; about 69 percent of the Sea Grant funds are currently going into research projects, about 18 percent into education and technician training and about 9 percent into extension services. A total of 72 projects funded at $1,425,721 account for the extension services total. Plans call for the advisory services percentage to rise from 9 percent to approximately 20 percent in the next fiscal year.

Sea Grant Program legislation stresses that research is to be mission-oriented; program guidelines and the Federal and local officials all emphasize the importance of the practical application of research results. In a very real sense, the success of the entire program depends on the strength of the advisory services component, for it is by that technique that research results are conveyed to users.

Advisory services activities vary. Program staff have been involved in helping State agencies and industry solve difficult questions of power plant location and the use of State-owned offshore lands. Specialists give advice to aqua-culturists and fishermen and work directly with the Governor's office and legislature when appropriate. A program funded through the University of Rhode Island coordinates all New England marine advisory programs, and the staff of the Rhode Island program works directly with a local fisherman's cooperative. *See Grant 70's*, a monthly description of advisory service activities, is published by Texas A. and M. University under a grant from the National Science Foundation. Nationally, over ninety separate businesses or corporations are involved with the Sea Grant program.

Size of staff and administrative sturctures for advisory services also vary. Oregon State University has a staff of eleven, and the University of Michigan currently has an advisory staff of one. Those two programs illustrate the variety of ways the advisory service function can be interpreted and operated and provide information on the differing ways research results can be made available to users.

Each advisory service program must be understood in the context of the particular problems and needs of the marine personnel of that area. Nationally recognized as the leader in advisory services programs, the Marine Advisory Program (MAP) at Oregon State University in Corvallis serves a State made up of small towns and small businesses. The fishing industry, which comprises both fishermen and fish processing plants, consists primarily of small family-owned operations. There is a dependence on tradition, a lack of sophistication concerning new fishing techniques, fiscal matters and modern management, and skepticism that there is much to be learned from "experts." Preliminary research by Oregon State University suggests that many fishermen would like to get out of the industry but they are trapped by their indebtedness and inability to plan effectively. A recurrent problem is the conflict between sports and commercial fishermen concerning fishing rights and entry to the harbors. And, finally, Oregon is a State with strong sentiments against "newcomers" who will bring the kind of development which produces urban, industrial problems.

Prior to his new appointment, the Director of the Marine Advisory Program had many years experience with the Cooperative Extension Service, and the Advisory Program still operates administratively under the Extension Service. The experience of Cooperative Extension has been crucial in shaping this program. The Director and his staff spent the first year of operation focusing on the lengthy and tedious job of earning the trust of the fishermen and processors. Great emphasis is placed by all the staff on the importance of meeting the needs which the users feel are important, rather than imposing research results upon them. One staff member had great success persuading the processors of the potential value of the program by demonstrating to them a simple device which tested the acidity of the water used in fish processing.

The staff follows the Cooperative Extension model of involving users in program planning, and advisory committees of fishermen will be or are active in each port or area on the coast. A series of "Town Hall Meetings" has been held at various locations on the coast to acquaint fishermen with new techniques and equipment and to hear their problems. During 1970, the third year of program operation, over 500 fishermen were involved in educational programs in financial management. One member of the staff concentrates on the development of new fishing gear; he claims that the success of his projects depends upon the degree of involvement by fishermen in the planning stage.

Their role as university personnel rather than government officials and the confidence they have been able to generate among fishermen and processors have enabled the Marine Advisory Program staff to play an important role in terms of the enforcement of Federal regulations. Over a dozen Federal and State agencies currently provide assistance to the fishing industry and/or enforce Federal and State regulations, and there is a great deal of distrust towards employees of these agencies. The Rivers and Harbors Act of 1898 requires that industry receive a discharge permit from the Army Corps of Engineers before discharging potentially harmful waste material into the waters. When environmentalists began to use this Act to force industry to lessen pollution, instructions were issued to fish processors by the Army Corps of Engineers, working jointly with the Environmental Protection Agency, on how to apply for a discharge permit. The instructions were hastily prepared; application forms were lengthy and complicated and revised at least once, and little concern seemed to be given to the range in size and sophistication of

businesses in the fishing industry. The staff of the MAP, because they were not viewed as Federal officials, were able to assist numerous owners of small processing plants to interpret and comply with Federal regulations. No other agency was available which had the same combination of expertise and acceptance by the fishing industry.

A second example of this role as an intermediary between the Federal government and the industry concerns a "Good Manufacturing Practice" issued by the Food and Drug Administration on "Hot Process Smoked Fish". This practice may eventually require a number of small companies engaged in fish smoking to revise their practices considerably. Although the regulation does not apply to the majority of smoking plants because those plants do not ship inter-state, it is expected that State regulatory agencies will eventually adopt a similar regulation. MAP staff currently are involved in planning workshops which will demonstrate to the owners of plants that a revision in smoking practices will produce a superior fish product. In this case, the MAP staff will be able to promote the spirit of Federal regulations without actual statutory authority, complicated enforcement procedures, and the inevitable attendant hostility between the government and the industry.

Oregon State University has also been active in encouraging cooperative relationships with other universities and Federal agencies. The staff, working cooperatively with the National Marine Fisheries Service and National Aeronautics and Space Administration, implemented new ways of predicting where Albacore tuna could be caught and initiated daily broadcasts to tuna fishermen. The National Marine Fisheries Service, which initially had responsibility for this activity, will now operate the program with modifications resulting from their joint effort.

A grant of $36,500 in Federal funds has been received for Pacific Area Sea Grant Advisory Program (PASGAP), an organization which will develop extension educational projects that can best be handled on a regional basis. The director of the MAP at Oregon initiated this program and will serve as its director. Six universities, including one in Canada, will be involved as will the National Marine Fisheries Service. An important part of the porject is a talent-sharing arrangement whereby experts from one university can be "borrowed" by another university member of PASGAP.

Overall responsibility for the Sea Grant Program lies with the Coordinator of Marine Science and Technology Programs; his title suggests Oregon State University has adopted coordination, rather than centralization, as a model for governing the Sea Grant Program. The Coordinator reports to the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies of the university and a Sea Grant Coordinating Committee, which is composed of two members each of the Schools of Engineering, Agriculture, and Marine Science and a representative of the MAP. That Committee reviews budget proposals from the three major components of the program, research, advisory services, and graduate education and training. The MAP is actually located administratively within the Cooperative Extension Service, and several staff members have joint appointments with the Service.

Several problems have resulted from this dependence upon coordination as a means of operating a unified Sea Grant Program. There are complaints that research is not focused on the direct needs of the fishing industry. Some conflicts between researchers, who generally are concerned with long-term results and basic causes, and extension personnel, who are eager to meet immediate needs, may be inevitable in any program. The lack of a director with clear authority, however, may exacerbate the problem by forcing both groups to spend unnecessary time "lobbying" for their particular interests and may create a situation where funds flow to the most persuasive spokesman or that section of the university which is best organized. At any rate, although the MAP has been able to draw on the talents of several departments within the university, there has not been marked success in inter-disciplinary research, and, in particular, there has been little involvement of social scientists.

More specifically, there is a problem of staff responsibility. If revision of a Sea Grant project is desirable, there are no clear ways of making necessary staff re-assignments. In the Marine Advisory Program, the problem of tenure for non-Cooperative Extension staff has not been resolved, and there seem to be no satisfactory policies for employees who are not directly responsibile to a university department. It should be noted that the Sea Grant Coordinating Committee at the university has itself asked for an evaluation of the administration of the program and there have been recommendations that a more unified, systems approach be developed for the program and more responsibility be granted to the director.

The experience of the Marine Advisory Program at Oregon State University does not provide simple or clear-cut answers for many of the major questions concerning community services. What their record does confirm, however, is the basic assumption that a national program must be flexible enough to respond to the unique needs of a particular geographic area. In Oregon, the size and constituency of the fishing industry require a Cooperative Extension operation which stresses recipient involvement and the necessity for convincing users of the value of the program. Their experience also suggests that if university advisory service staff gain the confidence of user groups, they can play a major role as mediator between the community and the government and can also serve as a vehicle for coordinating activities of Federal agencies and universities.

One tentative conclusion concerns administrative structure. Although the close administrative ties between the Marine Advisory Program and the Cooperative Extension Service may have been beneficial to MAP, the Sea Grant Program at Oregon does not have an administrative structure which permits long-range, goal-oriented program planning. Perhaps, to some extent, the high degree of user participation and the flexibility and creativity of the MAP



e68

require administrative independence and an ability to respond to immediate needs. If so, the experience of this program suggests that large-scale mass participation in a program may be antithetical to progress towards a specific and prior defined goal.

In direct contrast to the experience at Oregon, the commercial fishing industry in the Great Lakes area is neither large nor a major user group of advisory program services. The Sea Grant Program located at the University of Michigan serves a more densely populated area with a greater variety in industry and a more urban population. The program goal is described as "the definition of consequences of various alternatives in long-term development of water and land resources of the Great Lakes and the presentation of the knowledge to society as a basis for rational choice".

Size of staff and activities performed by the Marine Advisory Program also contrast sharply with those of the Oregon program. Currently there is only one full-time member of the Advisory Program staff; there are plans to hire an additional employee to serve as editor of publications. The Advisory Services Program has worked cooperatively with ENACT, a university-based environmental group and jointly sponsored a symposium on the "Future of the Great Lakes" as part of a university-wide teach-in on the environmental crisis. This program, however, has not stressed the wide-spread public contact of the Oregon staff or the range in user groups served.

It may be said that MAP at Oregon is successful in terms of outreach and is now attempting to develop a more unified program, and the University of Michigan program has stressed a systems analysis approach to Sea Grant from its inception, perhaps to the detriment of out-reach. Eight functions of research in the program were explicitly defined: 1) data acquisition; 2) system modeling; 3) definition of environmental tolerance; 4) definition of new concepts; 5) optimization on basis of multiple costs and benefits; 6) evaluation of future social and economic benefits; 7) evaluation of future technological inputs; and 8) application of current knowledge and predictions to decision-making. Each proposed project is evaluated in terms of its relationship to one or more of these functions.

Also in contrast to the program at Oregon State University is the administrative structure. Rather than serving as Coordinator, the director has administrative control over the program; he operates with the guidance of the Sea Grant Program Advisory Committee which consists of 12 faculty members from participating departments and is chaired by the director. A Policy Committee, consisting of deans and vice-presidents of participating schools of the university provides counsel on the proper relation of Sea Grant to the entire university. It should be noted, however, that the authority of this director does not extend to control over tenure and promotions of Sea Grant personnel. A recurrent problem in the funding of new programs at universities is the inflexibility of faculty personnel policies.

The decision to do a pilot project of research on Grand Traverse Bay in Lake Michigan is an example of the extent to which program direction is determined by explicit analysis of progress towards stated goals. There had been difficulty in deciding what were the most promising and necessary topics to research in terms of the over-all goal of providing alternatives for the development of the Great Lakes. It was felt that a study which encompassed on a microcosmic scale the kinds of information necessary for the total project would help clarify research direction. Typical of the approach at the University of Michigan was the clear delineation of goals of the pilot project: 1) obtain concrete experience in coupling field research and systems analysis; 2) obtain experience in multi-disciplinary research; 3) develop a methodology for working with state and local officials; and 4) have a guide for further work.

Also, in contrast to the experience at Oregon State is the considerable emphasis of the program on generating multi-disciplinary research. Over seven departments of schools of the university are involved in the program; they range from the Department of Business Administration to the Department of Zoology. This program has been able to use the talents of social scientists, and over half of the research budget is allocated to those areas.

Several factors seem to have been important in producing this inter-disciplinary cooperation. The first is the clear articulation of the goal of building a multi-disciplinary team for problem solving and the focusing of research around functions, rather than subject matter areas. Secondly, is the development of a structure which encourages communication among specialists in different fields. Monthly meetings are held at which presentations are made by researchers in each of the three major areas: socio-economic and political processes; chemical, biological and physical processes; and systems modeling. The Director of the Sea Grant Program at NOAA also stresses the importance of clear and evident support for the Sea Grant Director, both from the university and the Washington office.

Since the ultimate result of this program will involve decision-making by State and Federal officials, there have been numerous consultations with relevant officials in the area. The director has discussed the program with the following State agencies: Department of Natural Resources, Water Resources Commission, Water Development Service, the Attorney General of Michigan, and the Michigan Department of Commerce. Ten Federal agencies have also been consulted or involved in project planning.

Although a much greater quantity of information flows to users from the MAP at Oregon State University than from the one-man advisory staff at the University of Michigan, in one sense the entire Michigan Sea Grant Program is focussed on advisory services. It is significant that one of the research projects at the University of Michigan concerns the impact of scientific information on middle management in State agencies; research concerning the most effective ways to provide advisory services is as basic to this program as is research on marine affairs.

Certain obvious lessons are easily avavilable from the experience of the Sea Grant Program. The techniques of the



869

Cooperative Extension Service in involving users in program development are applicable in other fields. University personnel, if they gain the trust of the community, can function as valuable intermediaries between that community and the government. Programs must have sufficient flexibility to relate to local needs. The character of the user group must be considered in developing out-reach techniques. Program directors should have control of the reward system which affects their staffs.

A number of other observations are, however, more problematical, inconclusive, and perhaps, more important. No administrative structures have been developed which successfully combine a high degree of user participation and strong, centralized control which is oriented towards a specific goal. The Sea Grant Program does not suggest whether such a combination is possible. A successful multi-disciplinary program is difficult to accomplish and may require a degree of centralization which results in a loss of program flexibility. Perhaps the most valuable lessons of the Sea Grant Program simply confirm the cliche that administrative structures imply choices about program goals. □



70
71

# THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS AND EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL

In one form or another, the Federal government's commitment to education goes back at least one hundred and eighty years. The government's commitment to the training and retraining of teachers and educational personnel, however, is a much more recent commitment and seriously evident only within the past two decades. The history of legislation favorable to such actions as the distribution of Federal lands in support of the establishment of educational institutions, particularly the agriculturally and mechanically-oriented land grant colleges; school lunch and nutrition programs; vocational education programs; the education of veterans; and, more recently, school and library construction.

The concentration of Federal funds for such purposes has been a major factor in the advancement of education in this country. This concentration, however, is noticeable for its relative lack of interest in either educational manpower needs or educational curricula reform. As a consequence, the Federal government has played no consistently significant role in educational reform. (School desegregation–a decision of the courts and not of the legislative or executive branches of government–and the curricular changes instigated by the NSF institutes in various subject matter disciplines are major exceptions.)

This Federal inertia reinforces the strong convictions of many, both in and outside of government, that such a role is inappropriate for the Federal government, and that educational reform is essentially an inhouse matter for educational institutions themselves. Others are equally convinced that the acceptance of Federal monies implies the acceptance of some "accountability" for performance rendered. Occasionally, to resolve these two arguments, a rationale is offered which states that the Federal government itself does not initiate educational reforms, but that institutions which are recipients of Federal grants do.

This question has been debated for generations. It is only recently that the consequences of the debate are becoming more real and evident, now that the Federal government has made a decision to provide support to the training and retraining of teachers and educational personnel. In large part, this decision evolved from years of unchecked and unplanned expansion at all levels of educational activity. This expansion coincided with an equally impressive expansion of scientific and technological knowledge–a knowledge that increasingly has moved to the center of our national life and has been instrumental in affecting national priorities and decisions.

Education, in short, is now a matter of national concern. Teachers are now the largest single professional group in the country. An individual living in the United States spends more time exposed to the educational environment than he does to any other, with the single exception of his family environment. Each year, the combined total figure of the funds expended on education at all levels by Federal, State and local governments moves closer to the figure spent by the Federal government on defense. In FY 1970, the Department of Defense spent $77.7 billion on defense. In the same year, Federal, State and local governments spent $51.9 billion on school expenditures, with an additional $17.6 billion spent by other sources. Of this $51.9 billion, the Federal government provided $7.8 billion, most of it for elementary and secondary education; the State governments $20.7 billion; and the local governments $23.4 billion.

Despite the relatively small sum contributed by the Federal government, what has developed over the past two decades represents a major turning point in the Federal government's relationship to American education. The Federal government is now actively engaged in supporting the training and retraining of teachers and educational personnel. It remains less actively engaged in systematic curricular innovation and planning, and is still reluctant to admit to any consistent reform mission in education.

A movement in that direction may be inevitable and unavoidable. To help improve the quality of education in this country, the Congress first focussed its support on the physical needs of the schools and the universities and colleges. It later broadened that support to include assistance to students, particularly veterans. Finding this insufficient, the Congress still further broadened its interest

OE
71

to include support for teachers and, later, other educational personnel. It is now moving toward enacting not only legislation which will affect the student, the teacher, and the administrator, but also legislation which will provide comprehensive institutional aid to higher education as well. Developing simultaneously with this interest in comprehensive aid is a complementary interest within the Office of Education toward problem-oriented, as opposed to program-oriented, Education Renewal Centers. It is expected that these centers will also be comprehensive in nature, and that they will be located in sites with high concentrations of low-income and minority families.

There is a sequence to these events, but there is not always a consistent rationale for them. There are four major and representative pieces of legislation which have involved the Federal government specifically in the training and retraining of teachers and educational personnel. There are other Federal programs to support "educational leadership," but what the government identifies as educational leadership is not always clear. Leadership, in other words, may or may not include teachers. Regardless of this ambiguity, each of these four pieces of legislation has appeared at a certain period of time in the past twenty years, but information on how one piece of legislation either resulted from previous legislation, or helped to modify successive legislation, has never been adequately documented.

The four pieces of legislation are as follows: the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, and subsequent amendments; the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and subsequent amendments; the Higher Education Act of 1965, and subsequent amendments; and, finally, the Education Professions Development Act of 1967, an amendment to the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The passage of the Education Professions Development Act is by far the most far-reaching and all-inclusive of the four Acts, and the one which most seriously addresses itself to the task of educational personnel training and retraining. According to Public Law 90-35, the purpose of this Act is "... to coordinate, broaden, and strengthen programs for the training and improvement of the qualifications of teachers and other educational personnel for all levels of the American eudcational system so as to provide a better foundation for meeting the critical needs of the Nation for personnel in these areas."

Before focussing on one program of this Act as an example of a Federal effort for the continuing education of teachers, (the Career Opportunities Program), it is appropriate that a quick review be given here of some of the major breakthroughs and failures of the previous legislation. All these, in one way or another, affected the Education Professions Development Act, the most recent piece of legislation affecting the education of teachers. (Many of the EPDA programs are currently being reorganized or terminated, to be replaced eventually by as yet undefined new programs.)

*THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950*

From the beginning, the programs begun at the National Science Foundation were research-oriented. Basic research was at the core of NSF activities in the same way that applied research was at the core of the experimental field stations of the Department of Agriculture's Extension Service, although in both cases each agency has been subjected to substantial pressures to move it away from its original focus. Because the Foundation's emphasis was on research in the subject matter disciplines, and because only a limited number of institutions had the facilities to carry out advanced research, the NSF programs early established a reputation for supporting activities at only a select group of colleges and universities. This "elitest" trend has been modified in recent years as the Foundation has made conscious efforts to broaden its support to include other, less affluent, institutions.

Teacher training was not an early priority of NSF. In instances when NSF officials had to make a choice between research and teacher training as a priority, teacher training invariably took second place. Nonetheless, NSF has always recognized that teacher training is a major area of concern. This concern was expressed first by the establishment of training programs for college teachers. These programs were soon bypassed in size and number by similar programs established for the training and retraining of science and mathematics teachers at the secondary level. In the first years of the National Science Foundation only a small amount of its funds were earmarked for such purposes; but after the Russian space achievements in the late fifties, NSF's entire budget increased substantially, with sizeable amounts of funds appropriated for teacher training. In 1958-59, about $30 million was set aside for the training of secondary school teachers and about $2.4 million for college teachers. This ratio of the distribution of funds continued throughout the next decade, so that in fiscal year 1970, $23 million and $4.5 million were being spent respectively on such programs.

One fact was unmistakably clear to NSF program staff at the outset: the quality of teaching in the sciences and mathematics at the secondary level was even lower than had been anticipated. Consequently, it was understood that when time and resources became available, some means had to be found to change this pattern of performance if the over-all quality of teaching in science and mathematics was to be increased.

The solution adapted by NSF officials was one which proved to be a major innovation in American education. The creation of "institutes" to transfer knowledge from major research centers to the classroom practitioners was an approach which departed from the established educational norms. The institutes proved to be infinitely adaptable to a variety of institutions for a wide range of purposes.

These institutes began first as short-term summer institutes, and were later expanded to academic-year institutes and in-service institutes. This format required the presence of a handful of generally superior faculty and a



ED 072

limited number of teachers, brought together for a certain amount of time to learn a specific amount of subject-matter information. Initially, little consideration was given to the pedagogical problems of teachers (this was though to be the special concern of the schools of education.)

The establishment of summer institutes was a fortuitous decision. Teachers were free over the summer months. University facilities were generally free as well, as were the senior professors. Conflicts in schedules were minimal. Both teacher and professor were given a chance to improve their income (stipends and salaries were provided respectively), and teachers were enabled to advance professionally at the same time. A major advantage of the summer institutes was that they were developed at a time when there was a critical shortage of teachers. The fact that these institutes were held during the summer meant that badly needed teachers did not have to be absent from their classrooms during the academic year.

These advantages would be considerably less apparent had the NSF decided to restrict its teacher training and retraining efforts to full-year fellowship programs. Such a decision would also have meant that fellowship recipients would then have had to be absorbed into the existing academic structure of the university (i.e., regular course work, prerequisities, degree requirements), and would not have been able to follow a course of study specifically designed to assist their development as better qualified teachers.

This same principle of designing courses specifically for the special needs of groups of teachers was expanded into academic-year institutes, and, later, in a more modified way, into in-service institutes as well. These latter institutes are generally looked upon as the least expensive programs to design and mount. The in-service institutes are also considered by many the least successful type of institute because of the limited and fragmented amount of time a teacher is exposed to them. The in-service institutes did, however, provide a link between the problems of the classroom and the vast changes that were then taking place in course content, like the "new math." Teachers never trained in "new math" were nonetheless required to teach it. In their cases, the in-service institutes provided assistance in helping them implement new course material.

The academic-year institutes were a much more significant investment. Because the Congress saw them as an effective way of improving the quality of teachers throughout the country, the academic-year institutes received substantial Congressional support. The Congress demonstrated this popularity by periodically expressing a willingness to provide NSF with more funds if only NSF would give greater priority to implementing the academic-year institutes on a systematically broader scale. NSF officials, apparently, were willing to do this, but never at the expense of their more research-oriented programs.

In retrospect, the teacher training programs of NSF were more popular with the Congress than they ever were with the National Science Foundation. Because of this popularity, these and other institutes received sufficient funds to expand nationwide. Whereas in the past such institutes were generally confined to elite institutions and faculties, greater consideration was given to a more equitable distribution of Federal funds among a wider array of colleges and universities.

Another development which had great consequences was the establishment for the first time of "sequential" institutes. A sequential institute, as opposed to a unitary institute, is one that continues over several summers for the same group of individuals and which usually ends with a master's degres. The earlier unitary institutes were summer courses repeated over several years for different groups of teachers. Although these sequential institutes did not initially benefit from multi-year funding, such funding practices were soon adopted by NSF for both these programs and other programs as well, thus providing more flexibility for long-term program planning and program stability.

What the institutes also achieved was an alternative approach to the training and retraining of individuals already embarked upon careers. To the extent that these teachers were secondary school teachers, the institutes also effectively brought to the attention of the colleges and universities the urgent and special needs of the public schools, and provided these colleges and universities a convenient mechanism to demonstrate that concern.

In the beginning, the institutes were looked upon uniformly as experimental programs. Unlike many—some would say most—other Federal pilot projects, the NSF institutes *were* implemented on a national basis. Unfortunately, evidence is lacking to indicate that institutions of higher learning recognized the institutes as major breakthroughs in the teacher training process. Universities did not absorb the institutes into their systems as part of the core curriculum and, as a result, the institutes remained "uninstitutionalized." Perhaps the threat of a loss of Federal funds prevented the universities from absorbing the institutes into the structure, perhaps not. In any case, the range of institutes developed by NSF proved to be a breakthrough in the Federal government's assistance in the training and retraining of teachers. The only question that lingers—and it is a major question—is whether or not the institutes did indeed improve the quality of teacher performance in the classroom. This is a question which must be raised and answered independently of the question whether or not a teacher knew more as a result of the institute programs.

## *THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958*

Although NDEA Programs are not major programs of concern to higher continuing education, an understanding of their development is essential to an understanding of many of the legislative actions which were later to affect higher continuing education activities. The opening paragraph of the general provisions for this Act refers to "security," "emergency," and "defense." It was in the



ST 73

environment suggested by such language that the National Defense Education Act came into being. The Act was the cumulative product of what one person estimated to have been 1,500 separate bills dealing directly or indirectly with education, and which reflected the 85th Congress' anxiety about Russia's Sputnik and the educational system which made that feat possible.

There is a considerable question about the amount of planning which went into NDEA. There was universal consensus that the quality of teaching should be upgraded, particularly at the higher levels. Many also agreed that there was a shortage of teachers. Voices of dissent, however, were beginning to be expressed, if not heard, that the shortage was overstated and that an oversupply was actually possible if doctorates for college teachers were produced at the rate anticipated by the NDEA legislation. In its peak years, 1966-67 and 1967-68, NDEA, Title IV, was providing 6,000 new fellowships a year at an estimated cost per year of about $80 million. Between 1959 and 1969, about 27,000 fellowships were awarded at an estimated cost of $350 million.

Regardless of both foresight and hindsight, NDEA represents another major Federal effort in support of elementary and secondary education and, more particularly, higher education. Through this legislation, the Congress deliberately attempted to correct the imbalance created in the nation's graduate training centers by the Federal government's selective support of science and engineering. NDEA corrected this imbalance by providing graduate support for doctoral study in *all* disciplines, with favor shown to the humanities and social sciences.

Title IV of NDEA came to be known as the NDEA fellowship program. In addition, both Title V and Title VI of the Act imitated the National Science Foundation by establishing, first, short-term and regular-session institutes for teachers engaged in counseling and guidance in the secondary schools; and second, both centers and short-term and regular session institutes at institutions of higher learning for training in foreign languages and in such related fields as history, political science, linguistics, economics, sociology, geography and anthropology where current training was thought to be inadequate.

Like the NSF programs, the NDEA programs were categorical. Congress specified the number of fellowships, the subject-matter areas and indicated the kinds of institutions eligible for support. Congress also chose to go the way of previous legislation by restricting the distribution of funds to "new and expanded programs" at institutions of higher learning. Therefore, the Congress did not question the practice of channeling Federal funds solely through the university bureaucracy, nor did it question that such a practice inevitably, if inadvertently, reinforced the disciplinary and departmental nature of that bureaucracy. Congress supplied the funds. It gave limited thought to how those funds were to be administered.

Grants, in other words, went to institutions and not to individuals. Individuals applied to these institutions and not to the Office of Education. (Later programs did allow grants directly to individuals.) This formula had the advantage of bypassing the bureaucracy of the Office of Education. It also bypassed any temptation the Federal government might have to intervene by asserting any "direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel on any educational institution or school system."

The NDEA fellowships were research oriented, but only to the extent that this research was coupled to doctoral programs specifically designed to provide more teachers for universities and colleges. A significant departure in the NDEA legislation was the clear intent of the Congress to concentrate NDEA programs in small and medium-sized institutions, thus reversing the elitist trend in NSF to concentrate on universities with established reputations.

A major curiosity of the NDEA legislation was the reference in it to the actual "teaching" requirements for those who, through NDEA fellowships, were being trained for the teaching profession. No serious concern was expressed that potential teachers actually be provided with teaching experiences while being trained. The Congressional approach to this concern was to say simply that such experiences were not disallowed.

## *THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965*

Title V, Part B, of the Higher Education Act established the Teacher Corps. As originally planned, the Corps was to attract and train both experienced teachers and inexperienced teacher-interns with baccalaureate degrees to work at the elementary and secondary levels in areas with a concentration of low-income families. In actuality, however, the experienced teacher component of the program was never implemented, and the only substantial retraining that was carried out under this part of the Title was the short-course training provided for the leaders assigned to work with teams of teacher-interns. These team leaders were invariably qualified and experienced teachers.

Of interest in this portion of the Act was the consideration given to offering concrete teaching experiences to the interns engaged in the program. This consideration enabled the universities and colleges participating in Teacher Corps training to design and expand improved methods for preparing teachers for classroom work. It also gave interns the opportunity to gain actual teacher experience while assigned to local educational agencies, and to offer interns the opportunity to begin and continue their work for a master's degree.

Part C of Title V funds were used to implement an Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program designed to provide graduate fellowships leading to a master's degree for persons interested in a career in elementary and secondary school teaching. It is unclear why this provision was made in the Higher Education Act, since at the time of this Act's passage, the Congress was also considering the

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, where the provision's inclusion would have seemed more appropriate.

A final authorization in HEA was made for the establishment of short-term workshops and short-term and regular session institutes at institutions of higher learning for educational media specialists.

### *EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1967*

EDPA evolved in two ways: as an amendment to Title V of the Higher Education Act, which resulted in extending the life of the Congressionally popular Teacher Corps; and as a major effort to bring together existing and new programs into a unified statute that would, for the first time, give the Office of Education the authority to train all kinds of education personnel for all levels of education.

It is commonly noted that EDPA represents a turn away from the doctoral-level, subject-matter specialists who were supported and trained by NDEA funds, and toward more generalist personnel to be trained for a variety of educational responsibilities. Unlike NDEA, EDPA does not concentrate on the Ph.D. degree, nor does it concentrate on the upper instructional levels. More so than past legislation, EPDA reflected a growing concern for the manpower needs of the elementary and secondary schools; a consequentially decreasing emphasis on the doctorate; and a reevaluation of the training of educational para-professionals.

In the past, the significant manpower training bills administered by the Office of Education were categorical bills. As such, Congress exercised its authority and indicated its intent to the Office by enumerating programs, amounts of dollars, levels of education, numbers of fellowships and kinds of institutions to be affected by various legislation. The Education Professions Development Act departed from this pattern substantially. One of the chief architects of the bill has described it as "the most discretionary legislation in the education field."

In theory, at least, the discretionary nature of the legislation would seem to decrease Congressional control over it. By leaving the implementation of the bill to the Office of Education, the executive branch of the government achieves greater control over the directions such a bill will take. The discretionary nature of the bill would also seem to provide the Office with the opportunity to implement its own priorities and to tie the bill to education reform measures.

In practice, however, the discretionary nature of the bill is limited. Because EPDA, like so many previous pieces of legislation, was intended by the Congress to continue and expand earlier authorized programs, like the Teacher Corps, the amount of discretionary funds that remain to be used discretely is substantially decreased. What funds to remain are generally put aside to be used by the Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to implement their own priorities, where they exist.

In the case of EPDA, what evolved was a series of programs that attempted to improve and increase the education personnel (teachers, administrators, counselors, etc.) at all levels of educational activity. Past programs were carried forth from HEA and NDEA and new programs were designed to increase personnel for such priority areas as drug abuse, career opportunities, black colleges, early childhood development, teacher leadership, education for the handicapped, media specialists, teacher training personnel and, of course, the Teacher Corps. These programs were carried out through a variety of short-term and regular session institutes and through in-service and pre-service projects. A policy recently initiated by the Bureau of Education Professions Development, however, has led to a systematic curtailment of many of these institutes.

As already stated, EPDA was intended to collect and coordinate a variety of existing and new education manpower programs, and to provide a comprehensive response to education manpower needs. A fact of this legislation and previous pieces of legislation is that Congress clearly articulated in each of them the need for improved education manpower research and planning. The irony is that there is very little evidence to indicate that either substantial research was available to the Congress, when it said this, or that systematic planning took place prior to the enactment of not only the Education Professions Development Act but of any previous legislation affecting education manpower requirements.

### *EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT ACT, PART D: CAREER OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM (COP)*

Of the 143 programs examined in this review of Federal programs for extension and continuing education and community services, approximately 36 of them are involved significantly with the training and retraining of teachers. Of these thirty-six, 23 are located within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, with 21 of these 23 administered by the Office of Education. Fourteen of the 21 are administered by the Office of Education's Bureau of Educational Personnel Development. Only one program is administered by the Bureau of Higher Education.

The Career Opportunities Program (COP) was first funded in FY 1969 at $10,800,000 and increased in FY 1970 to $24,300,000. Like most of the other teacher training programs within the Office of Education, COP is administered by the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development. COP is representative of most of the objectives and policies of this Bureau and of the Education Professions Development Act which funds it.

The Career Opportunities Program is a nationwide effort to improve the learning ability of low-income children, particularly in urban areas. The key to this effort is the recruitment of low-income community residents and Vietnam-era veterans to work as education para-professionals in poverty-area school systems. About 28% of

those now participating in the program are veterans, although an original goal had been set at 40%. A small percentage of handicapped individuals are also recruited into the program as aides, with the remaining participants representing low-income community residents.

These para-professionals, or auxiliaries, are employed in minimal groups of six by local elementary and secondary schools (minimal groups of twenty-eight are standard for multi-school projects). These auxiliaries work beside the regular classroom teachers and assist them in teaching, counseling and administering. The auxiliaries are considered full-time professionals and are absorbed into the staff as vacancies occur. The presence in the classroom of these aides, most of whom are men, is a stark departure from the usual staffing patterns that exist at these schools, and is a major ingredient in what COP offers as a partial solution to the problems of teaching low-income youths.

COP is a work-study program. While the auxiliaries are working in the schools, they are provided with released time to allow them to continue training toward eventual teacher certification. The local educational agencies, which are the major recipients of COP grants, negotiate independently with local colleges and universities and cooperate with them in developing feasible projects. Both the local educational agency and the college or university are co-signers of the grant application. A Model Cities representative must also sign the grant application to assure, first, that those cities designated as Model Cities have been sufficiently covered by COP funds; and second, that the non-Model City area COP proposes to support falls within the poverty guidelines established for the program.

The desired academic load for an auxiliary is generally thirty credits—twelve credits during the summer and nine credits during each of the two academic semesters. In some instances, the cooperating college will grant three of these nine credits per semester in recognition of the supervised teaching that auxiliaries do in the schools. Although the program staff would like to see a total of twenty-four credits awarded for such teaching, most colleges are reluctant to do so.

The Education Professions Development Act generally prohibits the payment of salaries and stipends. COP is an exception to this rule. When funding is not available from other sources, COP may pay up to $90 per week, plus tuition, to veterans participating in the program. This payment does not affect the veterans GI Bill benefits. For non-veterans, COP may pay the cost of tuition. In all cases, however, cooperative funding is strongly encouraged, with local school systems and other Federal, State and local programs assisting in sharing the cost of the program.

There are currently about 130 COP projects throughout the country. Nearly 10,000 auxiliaries are employed by the local schools, with over half of the auxiliaries working in the area of early childhood education (kindergarten through third grade); another quarter in grades four through six; and the remaining auxiliaries in grades seven through twelve.

About 12% of all auxiliaries have less than a high school diploma, and the remainder have up to three years of college. The lack of education, therefore, is not an impediment to participating in a program that seeks eventually to provide a new kind of teacher to the elementary and secondary schools. The program is very much of a "risk" program, particularly because it additionally focuses on recruiting individuals who are indigenous to the low-income areas being served.

To attract veterans and community residents into the program, two elements are essential: motivation and incentive. It is difficult to conceive that individuals who themselves lack the necessary formal education ordinarily would consider themselves likely candidates for the teaching profession. It is equally difficult to conceive that individuals in low-income areas have the time and financial independence to continue their education without some kind of financial assistance.

These realities are taken into account in several ways. The key is the opportunity provided by the program for career development through what COP describes as a "career lattice." This lattice is further described as being horizontal, vertical and diagonal. Horizontal career transfer means going from one field of work to another, from instruction to guidance, for example, at the same level of responsibility; vertical transfer from one level of responsibility to the next; and diagonal transfer from one field to another at the next level, such as going from instructional aide to guidance assistant.

In addition to these career incentives, there are other incentives which offer to those in the program the opportunity to continue and complete their education while establishing a career. There are also, of course, the financial benefits that are provided, including both salaries and stipends. A final incentive which may rank first in the minds of many in the program, and which may often be only awkwardly expressed, is the desire to help low-income youths break out of the cycle of poverty that surrounds them.

The projects hinge on close cooperation between the local schools, the participating colleges and universities and the community itself. Local schools are required to commit themselves to the career lattice program worked out for COP. Since there is no guarantee that COP itself will continue as a permanent program, however, there is some question of how deep and permanent a commitment these schools can make to the program.

The unversities assist the schools in developing the various projects. This association is crucial. Although the local school systems initiate project applications, a four-year institution must be clearly designated in the application as cosponsor. Through this association, institutions are further and more directly involved in the problems and priority needs of the lower-level schools. This relationship is particularly helpful in getting universities to relax admissions requirements for COP auxiliaries; to grant credit for supervised teaching in the classrooms; and to work with the schools and State educational agencies in altering the



'75 76

teaching certification requirements that might impede placing personnel into the low-income schools who can relate and teach more effectively.

Each COP project has an advisory committee working with its director and staff in helping to develop all facets of project activities. As a rule, such committees are comprised of community parents, with local officials, leaders, teachers and administrators also represented. There exists also a Leadership Training Institute composed of leading educators whose advice is available to any COP project which requests assistance.

About 75% of the schools participating in COP are in the nation's inner cities, with about half of these cities designated as Model Cities. The remaining cities are in rural areas. COP projects are linked with a variety of other Federal, State and local programs, including Model Cities, Head Start, Upward Bound, Follow Through, VISTA and projects funded under several titles of the Elementary and Secondary Act. Most of these Federally funded programs provide to COP either community liaison, staff or training information. Other Federal programs may also provide funds. Under most plans, however, COP itself pays administrative costs and university training for the auxiliaries, while the cooperating Federally supported projects provide salaries or stipends. The latter is particularly true of funds from Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (grants to local educational agencies to assist children of low-income families).

COP's future is in doubt. So is the future of many other teacher-training activities within the Office of Education. It is assumed that many of these activities will be absorbed into the still-undetermined format of the Education Renewal Centers currently being considered. Regardless of this uncertainty, several observations involving broad issues can be made as a result of this brief review of major and representative teacher training activities of the Federal government.

The fact that COP funds are being coupled with other Office of Education and Federal agency funds, reflects a determination to deploy Federal funds in such a way as to have the broadest possible impact at the local and State levels. This practice also underscores the fact that, like so many other pilot project and demonstration programs initiated by the Education Professions Development Act, COP was never adequately or fully funded. Despite this limitation of funds, COP managed, wisely or unwisely, to establish over 130 projects nationwide among a variety of institutions and for a variety of purposes and clientele.

COP is not unusual in this respect. Many Offices of Education programs are conducted in this manner. The Office functions with many Congressional restraints and mandates. The directive to make programs truly "national" is certainly one of these. The policy of scattering projects, particularly when funds are restricted, may reflect other considerations as well—for instance, the uncertainty of the direction certain programs are to take, and the priorities and issues with which they are to be concerned.

This pattern of activity raises many crucial questions. When clearly expressed priorities exist, are those priorities adequately implemented when their implementation is subject solely to the receipt of unsolicited proposals? Can a program be said to exist which is occasionally little more than a collection of largely unrelated projects? At what point does a program cease to function on a pilot project basis and begin to function as a fully-funded program with long-term objectives? At what point does a program demonstrate that it is ready to be implemented on a larger scale? If a program is allowed simply to survive the vicissitudes or disinterest of its sponsoring agency, what credibility does it have both within and outside that agency?

These questions are not isolated ones, nor should they be addressed only to COP, to the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development or to the Office of Education. These are questions which may be raised about many similar Federal programs. They are inextricably linked to the other questions of program planning and evaluation.

Short-term funding means short-term objectives. Not every program, to be sure, requires long-term planning and objectives: there are many programs whose activities and purposes are clearly intended to achieve only short-term objectives. But the fact that we are talking about "institutions" implies a permanent investment for which long-term objectives would be highly desirable.

What has characterized many Bureau of Education Personnel Development programs has been their transitory nature. Perhaps because of this transitory nature there is less pressure to articulate long-term objectives. Or perhaps the failure to state convincingly what those objectives are is the reason the future of these programs is left in doubt.

This transient state of affairs is generally recognized by staff and personnel in the Office of Education. It must also be sensed by individuals outside the Office who speak on behalf of those institutions which are intended to benefit from Federal largess. Do these individuals, consequently, limit the degree to which institutional commitments will be made to Federal programs and national priorities? Indeed, why should any institution make any long-term commitment to a Federal program if it can receive no assurance that Federal funds will extend to the length of that commitment?

One result of this half-heartedness is to further entrench colleges and universities in their belief that the Federal government is simply an intermittant source of funds and not a source of technical knowledge, stable financial support and program leadership.

This is a tragedy, largely due to the instability and transitory nature of many Federally funded programs and the lack of evaluation and follow-through. It would be impossible to estimate the number of pilot projects funded by the Office of Education (and other agencies) which have had no sequels. No systematic attempt is made to evaluate these projects—even those where there is *prima facia* evidence that they should continue on a permanent basis.

Federal funds specifically earmarked for planning and evaluation are typically inadequate, and the common practice is to deploy funds for this purpose from program salaries and expenses, in competition with many other demands on this same fund category.

One last observation should be made. There are two sets of individuals affecting all of the teacher training programs of the Office of Education: the program managers and the fiscal managers. The individuals in charge of program matters are not the same individuals who control and monitor program funds. Cost accountability and program effectiveness are judged by different staffs. The dangers of this practice are real: should cost accountability be relaxed for more program effectiveness? Or should program effectiveness be determined by program cost?

This conflict is pervasive and disruptive. It creates problems for individuals within the government and for those outside the government, particularly at institutions of higher learning. This administrative conflict between the money managers and the program managers is a major element in the broader questions raised earlier about funding and objectives. To what extent is each afffected by the other?

A still broader question—and one that is an overriding factor in all Congressional legislation for education—is the supreme question of the relationship between private and public American education and the Federal dollar.* Our national tradition asserts strongly that government should only support education and not seek to guide or control it. Under this tradition, there is little scope for the exercise of leadership by Federal administrators, whose role instead becomes one of money-giving. While this tradition and the reasons behind it remain basically valid, there remains the need to develop a partnership between Federal program administrators and educational leaders in place of the donor-recipient relationship which now dominates. Development of such a new role in the face of legislative enjoiners and internal budgetary controls by persons outside the program present a difficult challenge for those responsibile for operating and overseeing Federally supported programs of continuing higher education. □

*The present relationship is succinctly stated in the following section of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

> *Sec. 804.(a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, or over the selection of library resources by any educational institution.*



ERIC 78

# REGIONAL MEDICAL PROGRAMS: A TEST OF LOCAL INITIATIVE

The development of timely and relevant continuing education programs in the field of health presents unique challenges and problems to universities and the educational community. Health is the only area in which the United States has a serious manpower shortage; that is the particular nature of the challenge. Continuing education programs which both increase the medical expertise of practitioners and train personnel in new roles which result in a more efficient use of manpower could significantly affect the current crisis in health care. Equally important are programs which would encourage health personnel to see their roles in the health system as a whole.

This challenge must be considered in the light of the paradoxical situation that a rapid increase in expenditures on health by both private consumers and the Federal government has been paralleled by a growth in complaints about the quality and availability of health care services. Expenditures have grown from $17.1 billion in 1955 to $60 billion in 1969, with a projected $100 billion level in 1975. Total Federal expenditures in FY 1970 were $330,136,000 for 22 programs of continuing and extension education and community services designed to improve public health. Three of these programs, one of which is discussed in this study, are primarily concerned with application of medical research results and 19 are focused on instructional services. All but two of these programs are administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The unique problems for the development of educational programs result from the fact that control of the health network is largely in private hands: the Federal share of the $60 billion expenditure in 1969 was about 30%. The lack of authority over the health care system by the Federal government is serious in light of a complicated evolutionary process which has led to the creation of a system which is unable to respond to changing social needs. The difficulties of affecting and improving the current pattern of health services can not be understood without some consideration of that process.

Dr. Basil J. F. Mott, a member of the faculty of Harvard University School of Public Health and a specialist in health activities and health politics, comments that "... fragmentation of services is not the result of poor planning; it is the product of an historical process in which professional practices and organized forms of service have developed from many separate and largely private beginnings that were not perceived as interdependent, and thus requiring coordination."[1] He stresses the wide variety and autonomy of organizations, agencies, and professional groups involved in the health effort and concludes that the way services are structured make it unlikely that sufficient change can come from within the field.

More specifically, Mott notes that the pluralism of the health world mediates against concerted action by health professionals and health agencies and that even the newest planning councils, which were established with Federal encouragement, have had little or no impact upon the major issues confronting our health institutions. "The main problem with health planning councils is their lack of authority and their lack of control over resources, such as funds and manpower, needed to bring about changes in the behavior of health practitioneers and health agencies."[2]

From the vantage point of the university, an entirely different set of historical factors has led to an analogous kind of inflexibility and unresponsiveness to changing needs which characterizes the health world itself. Modern medical education was greatly influenced by the medical reformer, Abraham Flexner, who in 1910 drew on the experience of German medical education and recommended that curriculum be standardized in order to raise the quality of medical schools. A standard medical curriculum was adopted by all accredited American medical schools that has not changed substantially in 50 years. Science and research were to be at the base of medical education, and the massive influx of financing for research in the biomedical fields led to growing specialization. Little attention was paid to the

[1] Basil J. F. Mott, "The Crisis in Health Care: Problems of Policy and Administration," PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW, VOl. XXXI (September/October 1971), p. 502.

[2] Ibid., p. 503.

institutional framework of the health care delivery system as a whole.

An influential report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Higher Education and the Nation's Health,* describes the effect of the Flexner model in this way. ". . . . It is a self-contained approach. Consequently, it has two weaknesses in modern times: (1) it largely ignores health care delivery outside the medical school and its own hospital, and (2) it sets science in the medical school apart from science on the general campus with resulting duplication of effort. This second weakness is now being highlighted by the extension of medical concerns beyond science into economics, sociology, engineering, and many other fields. Medical schools have had their own departments of biochemistry, but to add their own departments of economics and sociology and engineering would accentuate the problem of duplication of faculty and equipment."[3]

The difficulties of developing relevant continuing education programs must be understood then in light of these two factors–a health care network made up of separate, specialized, and independent agencies each jealously guarding its own territory and a medical education system which encourages compartmentalization of research specialities and has not been able to incorporate disciplines which could provide insights on the delivery of health services as a whole.

All of these characteristics of the health care system have a bearing on the initial concept of Regional Medical Programs and subsequent modification of the legislation. The impetus for the legislation was the report of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer and Stroke, issued in December 1964, which called attention to a number of needs and problems. Some of these were expressed as follows:

. A program is needed to focus the nation's health resources for research, teaching and patient care on heart disease, cancer, stroke and related diseases because together they cause 70 percent of the deaths in the United States.

. A significant number of Americans with these diseases die or are disabled beacuse the benefits of present knowledge in the medical sciences are not uniformly available throughout the country.

. There is not enough trained manpower to meet the health needs of the American people within the present system for the delivery of health services.

. Pressures threatening the nation's health resources are building because demands for health services are rapidly increasing at a time when increasing costs are posing obstacles for many who require these preventative, diagnostic, therapeutic and rehabilitative services.

. A creative partnership must be forged among the nation's medical scientists, practicing physicians, and all of the nation's other health resources so that new knowledge can be translated more rapidly into better patient care.

[3]"Higher Education and the Nation's Health," report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970), p. 4.

During hearings on the developing legislation, a significant change was made from recommendations of the President's Commission. Rather than the network of "regional centers," which had been suggested, spokesmen for practicing physicians and community hospitals expressed support for "regional cooperative arrangements" among existing health resources. The Act established a system of grants to enable representatives of health resources to exercise initiative to identify and meet local needs within the area of the categorical diseases through a broadly defined process. According to Federal officials, recognition of geographic and societal diversities within the United States was the main reason for this approach, and spokesmen for the nation's health resources who testified during the hearings strengthened the case for local initiative. Guidelines issued by the Regional Medical Program phrase the issue very clearly. "Thus the degree to which the various Regional Medical Programs meet the objectives of the Act will provide a measure of how well local resources can take the initiative and work together to improve patient care for heart diseases, cancer, stroke and related diseases at the local level."

Although the primary purpose of the Act was to transfer a body of research in the areas of heart disease, cancer and stroke to appropriate practitioners it should be noted that even the early development of the program related practice in those areas to a series of larger issues–the coordination of services, health manpower needs, and increasing costs of medical care. As the program evolved, a very significant shift in national priorities occurred. The three stages of development were described by one local program official as: (1) focus on updating skills related to three areas of disease listed in the legislation; (2) addition of programs concerning other diseases; (3) focus on improvements in the health care delivery system as a whole.

This shift was confirmed by the passage of Public Law 91-515 in 1970 which extended the Regional Medical Program legislation and included amendments which added kidney and other related diseases to those included in the program. More importantly, the amendments gave the program a specific mandate to "improve generally the quality and enhance the capacity of the health manpower and facilities available to the nation, and to improve health services for persons residing in areas with limited health services." It should be noted that the improvement was to be accomplished without "interfering with the patterns, or the methods of financing, of patient care or professional practice, or with the administration of hospitals. . . ."

Currently, there are 56 Regional Medical Programs which together serve the entire United States. (Total FY 1970 expenditures were $75,500,000.) Each RMP serves a geographically unified area which may be a State, a combination of States, or a sub-section within a State. Eligible grantees include public or private non-profit institutions, agencies or corporations. Policy for each program is determined by a Regional Advisory Group (RAG) which includes practicing physicians, hospital

administrators, medical center officials, and representatives of voluntary agencies, public health agencies, other health workers, and the general public. Programs for each region are developed both by the staff of the RMP and Committees of the RMP with collaboration of other relevant agencies, but they must have the approval of the local RAG before submission to Washington.

Data concerning the budgets of RMPs, the kinds of grantee agencies, the participation in RAGs and Task Forces are somewhat more expressive of the nature of the program and of changing priorities. Each RMP initially received a planning grant; by the end of FY 1967, 48 of the current 56 RMPs had received planning funds. By the end of FY 1969, most (41) regions had received operational funds. Current funding levels range from $8.3 million for California to $309,000 for North Dakota, with a median funding level of $1.2 million.

More RMPs are funded at universities than at any other kind of institution; of the 56 grantees, 34 are universities, 15 are new agencies or corporations, 3 are existing corporations, and 4 are medical societies. No definitive statement can be made about the advantages and disadvantages of university sponsorship. There are indications that RMPs funded at universities were able to develop programs more quickly because university staff were familiar with Federal requirements for proposals, but this early advantage may be outweighed by problems resulting from the degree of influence university officials continue to exert over the program. Current policy in Washington emphasizes the importance of control over the program by the RAG and views the university as a conduit, but representatives of medical schools are still able to exert a great deal of informal control.

Each RAG has a number of different Task Forces which are responsible for program development in subject matter areas and for soliciting the views of appropriate health care personnel through the region. In 1969, there were 492 such Task Forces; those concerning Heart, Cancer, and Stroke were most prevalent, with percentages of 13%, 12%, and 11% respectively. Nine percent of all Task Forces were concerned with the area of Continuing Education and Training. By 1971, the changing priorities had led to a decrease in Task Forces devoted to categorical diseases and an increase in those dealing with Continuing Education and Training. In 1971, the greatest number of Task Forces were in that area.

Before considering some of the activities sponsored by RMPs, it is necessary to consider again the nature of the health care system and make some assumptions about the kinds of continuing education programs which could lead to significant improvements. The first observation is a simple one. A massive continuing education effort is needed which must encompass both the transfer of new techniques and research findings to medical practitioners and train administrators and allied health professionals in new roles which result in a more efficient use of present manpower resources. Secondly, training programs will have to incorporate the insights and knowledge of social scientists; effective use of manpower is a management and conceptual problem. And, finally, the development of new roles implies a transfer of power. The success of the program will depend upon the extent to which the health care establishment can view itself critically and yield those duties which can be performed by para-professionals and others without formal credentials.

It is relatively easy to find examples of successful training efforts in many of the areas of critical need. The RMP in Wisconsin has been successful in bringing the skills of social scientists to bear upon problems of patient care. A patient care systems project was developed at St. Mary's Hospital in Milwaukee, with the cooperation of the University School of Nursing. A 39-bed conventional patient care unit was converted into a demonstration unit for optimal care of patients.

The strategy is to use patient care requirements as the major focus for change. In recognition of the complex interrelationships of personnel and resources in the delivery of patient care, a systems approach is used which will change personnel utilization environmental factors, communication methods, equipment and resources.

The project staff consisting of a team of two nurses, a systems engineer, a sociologist and a hospital administrator work closely with all relevant hospital departments in the design and implementation of the changes within the demonstration unit. The project is now in the implementation and testing phase and will be followed by a program of instruction for health teams from other hospitals to help them develop more effective patient care systems.

In North Carolina, the Duke University School of Medicine has developed a program for physician's assistants which will permit graduates to assume some of the duties formerly performed only by doctors. A program in the Watts-Willowbrook section of Los Angeles addresses a number of different critical issues of health care. The California Regional Medical Program is funding a Department of Community Medicine as part of the medical school in the Martin Luther King Jr. General Hospital. The Department will develop a system of medical care to serve the community's 400,000 medically indigent blacks and Mexican-Americans.

The hospital will be the first in Los Angeles County to make an effort to recruit and place local private practitioners on the staff. Local general practitioners have been encouraged to enroll in an intensive course in family practice at the Drew Medical School which will make them eligible to pass the Family Practice Board. The Department of Community Medicine will also have a privately funded health careers program to provide financial assistance to local residents interested in health careers. Also included in the department will be a MEDEX program to train military ex-corpsmen, a school of allied health professions, a community mental health center, and a clinical research facility.

A proposal with the potential for significantly affecting the nature of continuing education efforts has been developed with the help of the staff of the

Connecticut RMP. The proposal calls for the establishment of the New Haven Institute of Allied Health Careers which would enlist the cooperation of institutions ranging from the New Haven public schools to the Yale University School of Medicine. A key element in the program is the concept of building blocks or modules that are additive. The major innovation is that students could shift to tracks that generally are not available to students within schools of allied health. Thus, further education would permit a shift from a "dead-end" career to another career pattern.

These activities suggest what could be accomplished in the area of continuing education. The pattern of success throughout the country, however, is not uniform. Telephone conversations with program officials reveal that in most areas of the country, continuing education efforts have revolved around transfer of knowledge about those diseases categorically listed in the legislation. Where innovation has occurred, it has focused on imaginative methods of conveying such knowledge to users. Programs have also been successful in coordinating existing training programs and persuading institutions of the importance of establishing new programs. There has been relatively little impact on the continuing education activities of medical schools, nor have the RMPs been involved in the basic issue of professional certification. Training programs for the disadvantaged suffer from the weakness of similar programs funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Ways have been developed to use para-professionals in the health field, but no career ladders have been established which would allow them to progress.

The health care system is a multi-billion dollar industry characterized by rigidity, fragmentation, and elitism—all of which have contributed to the current paradoxical situation in which rising expenditures accompany a crisis in availability of services. It is a system largely exempt from Federal control with few points at which pressure can be exerted for change. In light of the extreme difficulties of reforming the system, the Regional Medical Programs have accomplished some significant changes.

Most obviously RMPs have succeeded in their initial purpose of transferring a large body of knowledge from clinical research about major diseases to practitioners. Techniques have ranged from the Dial-a-Tape program in Arizona which provides a physician immediate access to over 300 five-to-ten-minute taped medical lectures, to a program in North Carolina which offers weekly plane flights for physicians to a nearby university.

Regional Medical Programs have also succeeded in coordinating services which previously have been duplicative and fragmented. The structure of the RAGs requires the cooperation of many agencies and institutions which in some instances have had a history of conflict and professional jealousy. Just one such example of such cooperation is the establishment of the Cream City Community Health Center in Wisconsin which provides a prepaid health insurance program for the black community. Grant funds were obtained from the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Center is working with Medicaid, Blue Cross-Blue Shield and the Milwaukee County Medical Society to develop a completely self-supporting experimental health maintenance organization.

A notable accomplishment of RMPs in the area of continuing education and training is the simple increase of interest in the field and the recognition that training and continuing education must be available in convenient and relevant forms. The greatest percentage of RMP Task Forces and Committees are now concerned with that area, while in 1969 continuing education and training ranked fourth. Virtually all of the Regions named education or training as a major regional need.

Goals of RMPs are now larger than they were when the original legislation was passed; it could be said that the experience of this program in attempting to improve health care in selected areas has revealed the necessity of viewing the health care delivery system as a whole. The restraints of the legislation and the original concept of the program suggest three possible areas of difficulty in the future: (1) reliance on coordination; (2) lack of a research base appropriate for analyzing health care as a system; and (3) control of funds.

When the community action agencies (CAAs), funded through the Office of Economic Opportunity, began operating programs which involved that agency in controversy and political opposition, a subtle shift in priorities occurred. The operational role of CAAs was minimized; their role as a coordinator of existing resources was emphasized. At about the same time, City Demonstration Agencies were funded through the Department of Housing and Urban Development, also to coordinate resources. Now both sets of local agencies have the additional problem of coordinating their activities with each other. Rather than dealing directly with the issues of institutional change, the Federal government has a tendency to set up new agencies which will coordinate existing services.

Similar problems are developing with Regional Medical Programs. Comprehensive health planning agencies have also been established to identify needs and collect data on health resources. Cooperative relationships have been developed between the two sets of agencies, and their functions have been distinguished from each other by saying that RMPs are more expressive of the views of health services providers, while CHP agencies reflect the views of consumers. It is difficult, however, to understand why the Federal government should institutionalize the already existing dichotomy between the views of providers and consumers.

Another way of looking at the potential of RMPs is by comparing their structure and resources to those of the Cooperative Extension Service. Extension agents can identify the needs of farmers and then turn to university-based research stations for solutions. One of the primary initial purposes of RMPs was to transfer a large body of already existing research concerning major diseases to health personnel. Now, however, the program is concerned with need for reform of the health care system as a whole.

Research findings which could help in this process are entirely different from those relevant to heart, cancer and stroke; the field requires a multi-disciplinary approach, and is relatively underdeveloped. The Federal government supports major biomedical research efforts at medical schools which, according to the report of an HEW Task Force, may actually be counter-productive in terms of medical education,[4] but there is little research money available for the exploration of issues related to the effective management of the system or even for the development of new ways to implement biomedical research.

Perhaps the most important issue, however, is that of control of funds. It was mentioned earlier that the original concept of RMPs was modified during legislative hearings to place initiative for program development at the local level. This approach may have been successful when the problem was a relatively simple one of developing techniques which would meet local training needs. If a genuine and major reform of the health care system is intended, however, it may be necessary to develop and implement a national strategy. It is difficult to understand how major improvements can be made without "interferring with the patterns, or the methods of financing, of patient care or professional practice, or with the administration of hospitals."

A report of the National Academy of Sciences on Allied Health Personnel has bearing of this issue. The Academy was concerned with expanding the use of medical corpsmen who had been trained by the military to perform a wide variety of functions usually reserved for doctors.

Some of their conclusions are as follows:

*1. A belief that the military makes more effective use of supporting health personnel than does civilian medicine in the delivery of medical care is probably well founded.*

*2. The following characteristics of the military medical system–an authoritarian, centrally-managed system–are pertinent. (1) It can assign from enlisted personnel those to be trained in selected skills; (2) it can develop its own training programs and standards of skill to suit its own needs; (3) it can assign the personnel it trains for service when and where it needs them; and (4) it can provide incentives and rewards in terms of advancement in rate on the basis of the quality of leadership shown by the enlisted man, and not merely on the range of service he has been trained and assigned to give.*

*3. Civilian medical care cannot be described as a "system," but is rather a series of interlacing systems independently managed and unified only by the fact that its practices are molded by the customs and traditions of the profession of medicine. The training, certification, and licensing of supporting personnel are determined by a confusing array of professional, craft and governmental regulations and restrictions that tend to make dead-end streets of many areas of supporting medical service and limit the opportunity for advancement in skills, leadership, and economic rewards. This reduces the attractiveness of these types of service to alert and ambitious young people.*[5]

In short, the conclusions of this Committee suggest that the issue of who manages the health care system or if there is, in fact, any management at all has direct bearing on the efficient use of manpower and, therefore, on the purposes and nature of training and continuing education programs. All continuing education programs must relate to a larger system of values and roles; programs in the area of health seem to be inordinately strangled by the restrictions and rigidity of their particular system. □

[4] Ibid., p. 63.

[5] "Allied Health Personnel," report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Allied Health Personnel of National Academy of Sciences (Washington: National Academy of Sciences, 1969), p. 11.



S8 83

# VETERANS ADMINISTRATION: THE GI BILL: EDUCATION AND TRAINING

There are currently 28 million veterans in the United States. Together with their dependents, they comprise 48% of the American population. These are men and women who have served their country in both war and peace; individuals whose lives and careers have been interrupted by government service; whose husbands have been killed or disabled by hostility.

For two hundred years the government has been providing benefits of one sort or another to those who serve in its armed forces. The first major attempts, however, to consolidate and coordinate those Federal agencies, created especially for or concerned with the administration of laws providing these benefits, dates to 1930–the year President Hoover established the Veterans Administration by Executive Order as an independent agency.

To this day, Veterans Administration remains the largest single independent agency of the Federal government in terms of annual expenditures (FY 70: $8.8 billion), exceeded only by the three cabinet-level Departments–Defense, HEW and Treasury; and it is the largest independent agency in terms of Federal employment (FY '70: 169,000), exceeded only by Defense and the Post Office.

The size of Veterans Administration is impressive. One estimate indicates that VA has spent over $150,000,000,000 in support of veterans' benefits from 1944 to the present, with $21 billion of this provided for education and training. It was in 1944 that the 78th Congress passed the first Servicemen's Readjustment Assistance Act, commonly known as the GI Bill. The Act was a turning point in the history of the Veterans Administration, in Congressional legislation, and in the impact such legislation was eventually to have on American education in general and higher education in particular.

The Act was controversial from the start. Critics contended it was the greatest give-away program in history. Its supporters insisted that it was the right law at the right time for the right purpose. In retrospect, it appears that the timing of the bill's passage was the "rightest" thing about it, for within two years literally millions of men and women were to be separated from the armed services at a release rate that was never again to be exceeded.

The great anxiety of the Congress was to determine how these men and women could be returned abruptly to society without radically upsetting society and creating widespread disorientation. The solution: education and training. By providing education benefits to veterans, and redirecting many of them to universities, colleges and other post-secondary institutions, a way was found to better train individuals for a job market that at the time was ill-prepared to absorb them, and a way also to postpone and scatter the full effects of the termination of the war. Eventually, 7,800,000 veterans were to be educated and trained under the original GI Bill, with a peak being reached in 1947 when 2,546,000 veterans were enrolled at various institutions.

If the GI Bill lessened for society the consequences of the war's end, it did so largely at the expense of the institutions which had to enroll so many veterans. The war itself gravely depleted the number of students who were studying at institutions of higher learning. Some of these institutions closed as a result; most others were seriously threatened financially. Suddenly, and with minimal preparation, these same institutions were overwhelmed by applications and demands for education. A faculty that once was threatened with reduction now could not be increased fast enough. Dormitory space was at a premium, classes overloaded, and facilities and equipment pressed to the maximum. Quonset huts went up with regularity.

The GI Bill was enacted out of necessity and as a reward for those services provided to the nation at a critical hour. The irony is, however, that its passage forced the Federal government to assume a position vis-a-vis higher education that it was reluctant to assume in less urgent circumstances. The GI Bill was enacted at a time when the Federal government was determined not to have a Federal policy toward education, particularly higher education. This determination was made evident by the government's reluctance to consider or administer the educational benefits of the Bill as a "scholarship," which might more

directly involve the government with institutions of higher learning, and its insistence that the benefits were only an educational assistance allowance which could be used to meet, *"in part,* the expenses of his [the veteran's] subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, equipment, and other educational costs."

Federal policies toward higher education would not evolve until later, in the 1950s, when the Congress established the National Science Foundation and enacted into law the National Defense Education Act–both of which were also set up out of necessity, and in response to what Congress clearly perceived as national emergencies: the Cold War and Soviet technological advances.

The GI Bill, it should be remembered, was not solely concerned with education and training. The concept of Federal assistance for education and training was first broached when President Roosevelt was confronted with the necessity of drafting eighteen-year olds. In its final form, the legislation went beyond education and training and included home, farm and business loans; unemployment compensation; job placement assistance, and separation pay. It is this entire package of benefits that is more accurately called "the GI Bill." The original bill ultimately involved the expenditure of over $20 billion, with approximately $14.8 billion of that sum spent for education and training benefits.

Because of the unusual speed with which the Servicemen's Readjustment Assistance Act had to be implemented, a number of serious inadequacies appeared in the program from the start. Of particular seriousness was the system established for benefits payments. The original GI Bill called for two payments: a subsistence allowance paid directly to the veteran; and an independent contract with educational institutions which provided up to $500 per year for tuition, books and other educational expenses. The dual payments led in many instances to questionable or even fraudulent practices and to frequent over-payments to institutions.

A good deal of confusion also developed over the definitions of what rightly constituted a "course," "enrollment," "attendance," etc. But the greatest scandal of the day, perhaps, was the inestimable number of unaccredited vocational and trade schools that catered exclusively to veterans and which appeared and disappeared with notoriety.

To resolve these outstanding issues, a select committee was formed in 1950-51 to correct the abuses and inadequacies of the World War II program. As this committee was deliberating its recommendations, however, the Korean conflict erupted and altered considerably the situation in which these recommendations were to be made.

These recommendations were incorporated into the Servicemen's Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. It is generally thought that most of the weaknesses of the World War II program were corrected by this Act, and that the Korean veterans benefits program that resulted was more efficient and effective. The basic service period this act covered was June, 1950 to January 31, 1955, or the date of first discharge after January 31, 1955. Benefits could be filed for any time within the first three years of discharge and had to terminate eight years from the date of discharge.

For the World War II program, the service period covered extended from September 16, 1940 to July 25, 1947. Benefits could commence within four years from the date of discharge and had to terminate after nine years from date of discharge. It should be noted that servicemen in the armed forces between 1947 and 1950 were not covered by any benefits program.

In 1956, the war orphans, wives and widows program was created to extend education and training benefits to them. It was coordinated with the Korean program so that institutions training both veterans and dependents could do so without being confronted with two programs with varying procedures and guidelines. In 1964, the war orphans' program was enlarged to include the children of 100-percent-disabled veterans. In 1968 another amendment to the law provided benefits for widows of veterans whose deaths were service connected and wives of veterans who were permanently or totally disabled by service-connected injuries.

The final major piece of legislation affecting veterans benefits was the Servicemen's Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, plus later amendments to it. This was basically a continuation of the Korean program designed to include and benefit the Vietnam-era veteran. The service period covered by it begins on February 1, 1955 and has no ending date. Benefits may be filed for at any time but must terminate eight years from the date of discharge.

The magnitude of the GI Bill reflects accurately the dimensions of the social disturbances and institutional crises created by war. We now know that these same disturbances and crises can be initiated by an apprehensive peace. For the first time in our history, the encroachments of a Cold War and an interminable number of undeclared wars have left us with an extended compulsory military service and a guarantee that society will be required to absorb veterans for a number of years to come.

Institutions of higher learning may be spared today the high release rates with which they were confronted in the mid-forties. The existence of returning veterans intent on getting an education and securing a job, however, is as real an issue today as it ever was: in 1971 nearly a million servicemen were separated from the armed forces. In 1972, that figure is expected by Veterans Administration to increase.

Seventy-one percent of the Vietnam-era veterans have completed at least four years of high school. To the extent that they are interested in additional education, this makes them prime candidates for post-secondary continuing education. *(Of the 953,000 Vietnam-era veterans who enrolled in college-level programs, 340,000, or 36%, enrolled part-time.)* In contrast, only 38% of the World War II veterans had completed four years of high school, and 44% of the Korean veterans. Of the 15,182,000 veterans of World War II, about 40% elected to participate in the GI Bill's educational benefits. Of the 5,171,000 Korean

conflict veterans, 37% participated. Of the 5,138,000 Vietnam-era veterans, as of September of 1971, only about 35% participated.

This lack of growth of interest among veterans in seeking more education, and the implications this has for a job market which is already severely restricted, is a major reason why the VA has embarked upon a new policy embodied in its "Operation Outreach" program.

Project Outreach was initiated by VA in 1968 and is strongly supported by the current VA administration. Its purpose is to inform servicemen of the benefits to which they are entitled as veterans, particularly the education and training benefits. Although this information has always been available in the past to servicemen, Project Outreach reflects a determined effort to assure that all servicement are provided with guidance and counseling. This information is disseminated by teams located at major Vietnamese installations, at major separation points, at military hospitals and at newly created U.S. Veterans Assistance Centers (USVACS).

USVACS are one and two-man service centers set up as satellites to the fifty-seven regional offices operated by VA in the United States, Puerto Rico and the Phillippines. As originally conceived, these centers were to be staffed by representatives from VA and the Civil Service Commission.

Another more modest program, and of even more recent creation, is called SEEC, the Servicemen's Early Educational Counseling program. SEEC is a cooperative effort by VA, the Department of Labor and the Office of Education. The focus of this activity is on counseling and advising the servicemen of their education entitlements prior to their separation from the services. Approximately thirty-five trained education and guidance specialists are now serving in various foreign posts.

The professional qualifications required of SEEC staff are atypical of VA and represent a departure from the qualifications required of the VA staff administering the education and training benefit activities. VA staff has traditionally been composed of lawyers and quasi-legal professionals ("adjudicators"). Individuals with actual professional experience in the education field have been weakly represented on the staff.

Many of the decisions which had to be made originally in interpreting the GI Bill were highly legal and technical in nature. To some extent, this continues to be characteristic of current decisions. It would see reasonable to assume, however, that most of the legal "bugs" have been shaken out of the system, and that VA's administrative guidelines are now more clearly stated and understood. Nonetheless, adjudicators continue to handle questions affecting the administration of education and training benefits.

The absence of enough individuals with education experience who have either routine or periodic input into the administration of the education benefits program is a serious problem. This problem is aggravated by the fact that few educational associations are involved in the planning and policy apparatus of VA—to the extent that such an apparatus exists. VA has established minimal contacts with the education profession societies—and vice versa—and has an Advisory Council mandated by law, on which the Commissioner of Education *ex officio*, that appears to be more inactive than active.

The statutory council is called the Administrator's Vocational Rehabilitation Advisory Committee. Its membership is not specified by law, nor is its size. It presently has eleven members, although it periodically has had more or fewer members. Vacancies, therefore, can never be said to exist. Members are selected by the Administrator, who is not an official member of the Committee. The Committee members in turn elect a chairman from among their own ranks.

In theory, at least, the Committee's responsibility is to aid the Administrator in the formulation of vocational rehabilitation and education priorities and policies. This responsibility is difficult to implement, however, when the Committee meets as infrequently as it does (about twice a year), with no on-going working agenda, no stated mission, and at the discretion of the Administrator or Chairman.

There appears to be minimal input into the formulation of VA education and training policies and practices by individuals and groups outside of VA—a situation which would be less lamentable if there were more people within VA with educational experiences and information. Those individuals in VA who do have substantial educational information operate primarily at mid-level; individuals operating at the most senior level do not have backgrounds in the education field.

The American Association of Junior Colleges is one of the few professional associations actively working with Veterans Administration. With support from the Carnegie Foundation, AAJC is assisting junior colleges to respond to the heavy demands being made upon them by returning veterans. New programs are being devised, admissions procedures simplified, and information banks being established to help community colleges locate veterans within reach who might be motivated to take advantage of their educational benefits.

In addition to AAJC, the American Association of College Registrars and Admissions Officers is assisting VA to revise and reform its benefits application and reporting forms. The National Association of College Admissions Counsellors is also cooperating with VA in locating those two- and four-year institutions that will enroll veterans, preferably on an open admissions basis. Somewhat related to this, the Commission on Accrediting of Service Experiences, which is sponsored by the American Council on Education, continues to evaluate all military programs and courses to enable veterans to gain credit from universities for program-related military training, such as electronics or languages.

These activities, as welcome as they are, should not cloud the fact that most of the educational associations and institutions are in no way involved with VA's education and training activities, either on a formal or informal basis. What is puzzling about this lack of cooperation is that in

other areas of VA activities, strenuous efforts are made to establish close ties with the appropriate outside agencies and institutions. This is particularly true of the intimate association which has developed between VA hospitals and university medical schools.

The VA central office has a core staff of about 130 professionals dealing with educational benefits, although not all of these people deal only with educational benefits; most deal with compensation and pension benefits as well. However, the size of the staff has not always reflected the amount of work the staff was required to do. In 1964, for instance, a combined staff of over two hundred individuals was on hand at a time when only 6,000 veterans were being trained. The staff is part of the Compensation, Pension and Education Service, which is headed by a Director who reports to the Chief Benefits Director of the Department of Veterans Benefits. The Chief Benefits Director reports directly to the Administrator.

Education benefits, in other words, are not administered as an autonomous unit within VA. The Service which administers education benefits deals also with compensation and pensions benefits. A separate Vocational Rehabilitation and Education Benefits Service (the name still carried by the Advisory Council) once existed as an independent unit but was coupled with the Compensation and Pension Service in 1964 to form what now appears as the Compensation, Pension and Education Service.

The rationale provided for this union was the expectation that the two separate services might be more efficiently operated as a single administrative unit. It was known that the peak work loads for the education benefits staff came in September-October, while the peak work loads for the compensation and pension staff came in January, February and March. VA also felt that the cross-training of professional staff was desirable, and that the creation of a new service incorporating all compensation, pension and education benefits would be more conducive to such cross-training.

The staffing and administrative pattern which appears in the central office is largely repeated at the fifty-seven regional offices. In these offices, also, adjudicators provide the main administrative support for the education and training activities. The background of these adjudicators is similar to that of the adjudicators in the central office. Unlike the central office, the regional offices do not have advisory committees working with them on a State-wide basis, even though such committees could provide the regional offices with substantive information and guidance and would, consequently, seem highly desirable. This possibility, however, would have to be considered within the context of the degree to which regional offices exercise independence from the central office. As a regulatory agency, Veterans Administration must operate with serious regulatory restraints. These restraints have been carefully elaborated by the Congress and restrict not only whatever tendencies that might appear in the regional offices to exercise independence, but whatever similar tendencies which might also appear in the central office.

It is to these regional offices that veterans actually file for education benefits. Once the application is filed, and assuming the veteran has been honorably discharged and has been in the service for 181 days, he will receive from the regional office a certificate of eligibility. This certificate entitles him to his benefits, and it is left to the veteran's discretion where and when he will take advantage of them. Although the veteran is entitled to other kinds of training, like flight training, on-the-job training and farm cooperative training, the great majority of veterans approach two- and four-year institutions for their training.

Each regional office keeps a list of institutions within the State whose programs and courses have been approved. These institutions earlier had approached VA with requests to participate in the VA education benefit activities. However, the actual approval of their programs is left not to VA but to whichever agency or agencies are designated that responsibility by the Governors of the States. For most States, the designée is the State education agency.

The State provides this service to VA as a result of a contract negotiated between the State and the regional VA office. State agencies are reimbursed for these services, and payment is made to the State to cover the salaries, travel and other administrative expenses of the State staff. State agency personnel providing only part-time services to VA are compensated accordingly. This exchange of services is the major extent to which the regional offices and the State agencies have routine contact.

Once a veteran has been accepted by an institution and enrolls in an approved program or course, the institution returns to the regional office a certificate of enrollment. As soon as this certificate is received by the regional office and is processed by the central VA office, the veteran is sent his first check by the Treasury Department. In the original GI Bill, two separate payments were made: one directly to the veteran as a subsistence allowance, and one directly to the institution to help defray educational costs. This system resulted in a mammoth voucher system that proved ineffective and has since been discontinued.

The practice now is to send one check directly to the individual, which he can use either as a subsistence allowance or an educational allowance. For those enrolled in full-time study, the check is usually for $175, with increments provided for dependents.

In effect, today's veteran is receiving less from the government than his predecessors and is expected to do more with it. Few veterans can subsist and pay the expenses of their education, either in whole or in part, with their monthly payments. A major result of this dilemma is that most veterans gravitate toward less expensive public institutions, have spouses who work, or work themselves part-time.

The seriousness of this problem is partly ameliorated by a recent action taken by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Amendments have been made to a variety of HEW programs to allow increased payments of Economic Opportunity Grants and work-study grants to

veterans as a means to supplement their income while in training. In addition, several Office of Education programs, like the Career Opportunities Program and other teacher-training programs, give priority consideration to veterans. (The House Veterans Affairs Subcommittee currently has before it recommendations supported by the President that VA education and training allowances be increased.)

Among other innovations which have appeared in the current GI Bill is an allowance provided to the educationally disadvantaged. This special assistance is intended to help veterans who have academic deficiencies attain a high school diploma which will then enable them to pursue courses in higher education. It is also intended to help veterans pursue post-secondary education through tutorial assistance at the secondary level.

To assist these educationally disadvantaged veterans, Congress has enacted a program called PREP (Predischarge Education Program). PREP's purpose is to provide ill-qualified servicemen with an opportunity to receive a high school diploma or remedial training to better prepare them for higher and vocational education after separation. This program does not affect the other educational benefits to which these veterans are entitled.

Once separated from the service, these disadvantaged veterans and other veterans are affected by a problem which persists in the administration of VA education benefits. It is the problem of the kind of language which was used in past legislation and is used in current legislation. The statutes refer repeatedly to "credit hours," "courses," "semesters," "attendance," "absences," "enrollment" and other terms that reflect only a very traditional and narrow view of what comprises an educational program. The language is an impediment to a recognition of other legitimate educational experiences, and fails to take into consideration the variety of special educational opportunities for which this language has no meaning. Must a veteran be enrolled in a "course" for a specific number of "credit hours" and actually "attend" a course in order to qualify for benefits?

It is not clear how aware VA authorities are of the increasing number and acceptance of non-traditional forms of education. Considering the quasi-legal backgrounds of the adjudicators who must actually pass judgment on cases where such questions arise, the situation would seem to require a revision of the wording of the GI Bill, or at least the establishment of guidelines to make specific allowances for such non-traditional educational activities.

Despite the overwhelming impact that the GI Bill has had upon institutions of higher learning, Veterans Administration has had minimal direct and routine contact with colleges and universities. This relationship seems to be conceived as a monumental administrative detail, to be handled at VA's end by adjudicators, and at the university's end by a veterans' representative. This latter individual is generally a full- or part-time clerk in the registrar's office. With payments now being made directly to veterans and not to institutions, the relationship between VA and the universities is even more limited than at any time in the past.

The only statement which VA routinely requires from institutions participating in VA education activities is a certificate of attendance. This certificate is sent to VA at the termination of a particular program and is intended to confirm the fact that the veteran actually attended the program in which he earlier had stated that he was enrolled. Between the receipt of the veteran's certificate of enrollment and the institution's certificate of attendance, therefore, VA must operate on an "honor system" of sorts and assume that the veteran is telling the truth. Over the years, billions of dollars have floated freely on this reporting system.

This practice of direct payment to individuals, and the reporting system which accompanies it, is a practice entirely out of keeping with the Federal government's usual elaborate attention to fiscal monitoring and responsibility. What this suggests is that at a given point in time, VA cannot give assurances to the Congress or to the public at large that VA benefits are actually accomplishing what they were originally intended to accomplish. Infractions of this system are probably minor, but a minor percentage of so large a fiscal program may appear to some individuals to be a sizeable amount of money.

Veterans Administration has stewardship over a vast budget serving a vast number of American citizens. Although VA itself is a highly visible and structured institution, the clientele it serves—the veteran—defies easy categorization. Veterans fall into an endless variety of categories, each category requiring special benefits and special services. Veterans are represented in significant numbers at every level and in every kind of post-secondary educational activity.

How institutions of higher learning respond to veterans' educational needs is one question; how the Veterans Administration responds to these needs is another question entirely and is an appropriate subject for review and scrutiny. Unfortunately, systematic and substantial reviews of educational activities, other than in-house staff reviews, do not appear to have taken place over the years. The concerns routinely expressed by VA staff are generally restricted to administrative matters like improved certificate forms and individual and institutional reporting. Expressions of concern about substantive program matters involving educational theory and practice are few. These program matters seem genuinely to be beyond the scope and capacity of many VA decision makers.

The present staffing pattern that appears both in the central VA office and in the regional offices, and at every level of administrative responsibility, is simply not conducive to providing sufficient credibility to VA's total commitment to the educational needs of veterans. That commitment is only partial—like the VA allowances which are intended by the Congress to help veterans "in part" to meet the expenses of their educational programs.

VA does not appear to be sufficiently interested in absorbing educational professionals into its structure. It

does not appear interested in going outside of its structure to gain access to vital resources which might, for instance, have helped call into question the terminology of much of the statutory language affecting VA operations.

The GI Bill is one of the great innovative programs of the Federal government in this century. The Bill's impact on American education and institutions of higher learning has been profound. It is doubtful if the magnitude of that impact can ever be soundly evaluated. But considering this magnitude, it is incomprehensible that there does not exist anywhere in the entire VA administrative structure a single autonomous unit dealing clearly, primarily and substantively with educational activities.

The absence of such a unit is a significant indication of VA's tenuous relationship with the academic world. VA lagged behind other Federal agencies in responding to the legitimate needs of the educationally disadvantaged. There is still some question as to how far it has progressed in organizing itself in such a way that other equally urgent educational needs can be identified and resolved systematically. An encouraging recent development has been the creation of a National Task Force on Education and the Vietnam-Era Veteran. This Task Force will bring together representatives of the academic community and Veterans Administration to discuss the special educational needs of the newer generation of veterans.*

One of the immediate problems the Task Force may have to confront is the effect VA's statutory language has on the administration of VA's education benefits. VA's statutory language is elaborate and somewhat inconsistent with much of what is occurring in higher education today. The precision of the definitions which appear in this language parallels the strict attention VA has had to pay to the legal nature of its operations and to the existence en masse of "adjudicators." In contrast to the conciseness and detail of the legislative language, there exists a fiscal reporting system that is unique within the Federal government for its relative simplicity—a simplicity which might startle other Federal agencies and private corporations by its vulnerability to abuse and its resistence to fiscal monitoring.

Apparently, Veterans Administration feels that both the language which appears in the statutes, and the fiscal disbursement and reporting system which it administers, are preferable to alternatives. If the VA had established a more permanent link to the educational community, and had encouraged the regional offices to do likewise; had a more credible advisory committee; and had gone more routinely to non-government educational associations for professional assistance, then it might at least have realized the inadequacies of the law it has been mandated by Congress to regulate.

The educational community itself has been lethargic in awakening to the help it might offer to VA in administering one of the largest Federal programs of educational assistance. Cooperation between VA and the educational community on matters relating to veterans benefits would enlarge greatly the ability of each to design more responsive programs for one of the most significant manpower resources of the nation. The improvement of educational benefits to veterans, and the desirable effects this would have on the educational institutions themselves, are sufficient reasons to encourage this cooperation. A further reason is the stimulation such cooperation would bring to Veteran Administration in helping it extend its services and benefits even further, thus enhancing the possibilities that the quality of life among so large a percentage of our population will be increased, and that VA will account with even more surety for its stewardship. □

*Since this study was written, the Task Force has completed its initial agenda and has made a number of recommendations to the Administrator of Veterans Administration which, if adopted by VA, may resolve many of the issues raised in this study.*

# LEGAL SERVICES: UNIVERSITY AS ADVOCATE

Most community service programs serve only a selected segment of society. The Cooperative Extension Service–the forerunner of all university extension activity–provides assistance for those concerned with the development of the land, and the Sea Grant Program, its most recent off-spring, funds programs related to marine affairs. "Backup centers" at universities, funded by the Legal Services Division of the Office of Economic Opportunity, also serve specialized clientele. These centers are intended to provide research, training, and technical assistance services to Neighborhood Legal Services Law Offices which, in turn, provide legal aid to the poor. Their staff is also involved in the identification of legal issues and "test cases" which affect the rights of the poor and with the development of appropriate legislation.

What the constituents of the Cooperative Extension Service have in common is that the way they make their living involves development of the land; what the constituents of Legal Services have in common is their poverty and vulnerability. The nature of this clientele and purpose of the program raise a series of questions concerning the kinds of community service programs a university can effectively operate. Should a university become involved in an effort which is intended to change the alignment of power within American society? What problems result when a university program assumes an advocate role for a group whose needs require changes in other major institutions of the society?

The answers to these questions are important for many reasons including whether universities should undertake operational roles in poverty programs. There is increased concern within the Federal government about the importance of the implementation of research results and a recognition that reports and studies alone will not solve community problems. Implementation of social research, however, involves value judgments, controversy, and a kind of politicization of the university which may be unacceptable to the larger society. This program, in some sense, tests whether and in what ways the university can serve the disadvantaged.

A consideration of the kinds of services the university can provide the disadvantaged relates to another current issue. There is increasing pressure on universities to become "relevant," both in terms of the responsiveness of curriculae to changing social patterns and the degree of involvement in community life and national issues. Attempts to become relevant vary; they range from advocacy of political positions by university officials to experimentation with new ways of governing campus life. One of the major challenges to the university is to develop appropriate interaction between its teaching and community service functions. How can the experience gained from community involvement be used to develop and modify course offerings so that they will provide students more relevant education?

Consideration of ways universities can become effectively involved in serving the disadvantaged is particularly crucial in light of the heavy Federal involvement in this area. Of the 143 programs reviewed in this study, 10 are designed to serve the disadvantaged. Total Federal expenditures on these programs were $1,517,846,000 in FY 1970. (This total may be misleading since it includes one program funded at $1,219,145,000, of which only an estimated $65,975,000 went to colleges and universities.)

The Neighborhood Legal Services Center Program is one of the major efforts of the Office of Economic Opportunity and one which has grown significantly. Funded at $61,000,000, it is the second largest specialized program funded by the agency. It provides legal aid for poor people, encourages the development of a cadre of lawyers with expertise in poverty law, and promotes law reform which will protect and make explicit the rights of the poor.

During the initial period of program operation, two major problems were identified by Legal Services staff. Since legal services for the poor was an under-financed and relatively neglected field, there was a great dearth of lawyers with the appropriate expertise; research in the field of poverty law was similarly under-developed. Secondly, although a primary aim of the program was to institute law

reform through a selective use of "test cases," lawyers in Neighborhood Centers were inundated by requests for standard services which merely met immediate needs. There was a clear need for a resource center which could undertake basic research, identify important legal issues and develop training programs and materials for use by the practicing attorneys.

At the same time that the Office of Economic Opportunity was initiating its legal services program, the National Welfare Rights Organization was gaining considerable strength and calling attention to some similar issues. At that time, it was one of the few national organizations which united poor people around a specific issue and challenged Federal and local regulations by legal process. The Stern Family Fund gave a small grant to fund the Center for Social Welfare Law and Policy at the Columbia School of Social Work for a program which was to bring "test cases" to court concerning welfare law. This program was subsequently funded by OEO and became the prototype for other backup centers.

Universities were chosen as the grantees for the centers primarily because of their resources in terms of faculty, students and library materials. In addition, OEO legislation provides the opportunity for a Governor to "veto" programs operating in his State; programs funded at universities are not subject to this veto. Currently there are back-up centers in eleven subject matter areas: consumer law, economic development, education, employment, aging, health, housing, Indians, juveniles, migrants, and social welfare. Budgets for the centers during FY 1971 range from approximately $65,000 to $373,000. All but two of the programs are funded at universities.

Statements issued by OEO suggest the range of activities in which backup centers are engaged. Publications by the centers added considerably to the base of legal knowledge concerning the following areas of the law.

– Handbooks on the Federal Truth in Lending Act and the Federal Fair Credit Reporting Act were published and distributed to local programs along with handbooks on Federal educational programs for Indians and model State statutes on the needs of the elderly.

– Litigation packets were prepared for juvenile court practice and for litigation arising from violations of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibiting discrimination by private employers.

The Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law at Columbia University successfully assisted local Legal Services attorneys in reversing a State of Nevada decision to raise welfare eligibility standards which would have denied benefits to 25% of the families then receiving them.

The National Consumer Law Center was invited by the Department of Labor to assist in the examination of applications submitted by States requesting exemption from Federal wage garnishment restrictions contained in the Federal Consumer Credit Protection Act.

The National Housing Center, in conjunction with the National Tenants Organization, negotiated with the Department of Housing and Urban Development on proposed public housing regulations. As a result, new requirements that all public housing authorities provide certain lease and grievance procedures to tenants were adopted. These provisions further protect the rights and interests of the public housing tenant and were primarily based on model agreements developed by the Center.

The Joint Commission for the Accreditation of Hospitals recently adopted new standards with respect to health care for the poor which it will require hospitals applying for accreditation to meet. The standards adopted by the Commission were substantially those suggested by the National Legal Program on Health Problems of the Poor at the University of California at Los Angeles. Much of the concern directed toward providing better care for the poor, as expressed in the Preamble to the statement of standards, can be directly attributed to the Center's participation in the development of that document.

In an attempt to increase the participation of the poor in the private sector, the National Economic Development Center has provided specialized legal assistance to community based economic development projects throughout the country. Through its efforts, the first Minority Enterprise Small Business Investment Corporation was established, in a small rural Georgia community. Many of the newly developing enterprises assisted are agricultural and marketing supply cooperatives.

A particularly strong feature of this program in terms of administration from the Washington Office, is the system of evaluation. In other Federal programs, evaluation has suffered from both a lack of understanding of local needs and program purposes and little or no follow-up by Washington on recommendations of the evaluators. Evaluation of this program would appear particularly difficult because it is dealing with a relatively undeveloped field–poverty law–and because its advocacy approach is new.

Annually, a team of evaluators consisting of experts in poverty law and administrative staff of other similar programs makes an on-site visit to each center. Conversations are held with program staff and there are telephone interviews with people who have used the services of the program. Evaluation findings are discussed with the program director, and occasionally the Washington staff will add a "Special Condition" to the grant if they want to ensure that particular changes are made. Program directors confirm that evaluations are helpful to them and have resulted in substantive changes in their programs.

Backup centers appear to be accomplishing their major purposes of developing training materials, providing research services and encouraging law reform. There is less evidence of success, however, in the pattern of program-university relations. Perhaps the problems can best be divided into two categories–the impact of the university on the program and the impact of the program on the university.

In conversations with program and Washington staff, invariably there were complaints about the percentage of indirect costs the university charged for operation of the

program. Indirect costs are a percentage of salaries for the grant; they range from 20% of salaries to 34% of total direct costs. This expense is felt particularly acutely because budgets for backup centers are small–none exceeds $400,000 annually–and the demands on the program are immense.

The general method for determining indirect costs is to rely upon the indirect cost rate negotiated by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. That rate is negotiated annually by HEW auditors; the assumptions behind this method are that valuable time would be wasted by both Federal and university officials if an indirect cost rate had to be negotiated for each grant to a university and that any individual inequities which may result in applying the same rate to different programs will average out when all programs at the university are considered.

The limited overall budget for this program resulted in a decision by OEO officials to attempt to negotiate with universities for a reduction in the indirect cost rate from those figures negotiated by HEW. Some universities have accepted lower figures, but they have become increasingly reluctant to negotiate.

A precedent does exist for an agency to pay indirect costs at a rate lower than the HEW negotiated rate. Policy for funding training grants by HEW stipulates that indirect costs will not be paid in excess of 8%. The Office of Management and Budget has also indicated that agencies may negotiate if they feel elements of cost included in the computation of the various university overhead rates are not associated with the performance of the project to be funded.

The effects of the struggle over indirect costs have been severe in terms of university-program relationships. In some cases, the indirect cost rate may result in disaffiliation of individual universities with the program. Almost without exception, much time and energy has been spend by program and university officials on the issue, and resentments and misunderstandings have occurred which have prevented the development of a good working relationship. Advocates of the program in the university are forced to spend time defending the indirect cost rate negotiated by OEO to other officials within the university, rather than promoting the program itself.

Problems resulting from the inflexibility of faculty personnel policies were mentioned by program staff almost as frequently as those concerning indirect costs. Legal secretaries command particularly high salaries in relation to others in the secretarial field; secretaries at universities traditionally receive low salaries. In some programs, program directors have, however, been restricted to the university pay schedule in hiring secretaries. Some of the program directors do not have control over raises for their staff, and university freezes on hiring and raises have occasionally been applied to backup center programs. In general, program staff seem to have few of the advantages of faculty position and most of the disadvantages.

The assumption behind placing the centers at universities was that program staff would have access to the resources of the university such as the faculty, students and the library. When questioned about the advantages of university affiliation, most program directors mentioned access to legal experts on the faculty. Involvement of faculty seems, however, to have been on an erratic basis. In some cases program staff have consulted members of the faculty with appropriate legal specialties, and faculty members have initiated involvement with the program, but there is little formal involvement of law faculty. Administrative structures have not been developed, either by university officials or program staff, which would encourage regular sharing of information.

A basic tenet of OEO policy is that constituents of a program should be involved in program development and the formulation of policy. Backup centers could be said to have two groups of constituents: lawyers in Neighborhood Legal Services Offices and the recipients of legal services. The general pattern of OEO programs has been to include constituents on a policy-making board; with one exception, this approach has not been applied at the university-based backup centers. Agreement has been reached with the Dean of the Law School at University of Pennsylvania to allow a policy-making board of representatives from the health services field to advise the program staff of the Health Law Project on issues for curriculum development and on staff appointments. (That program is funded through the Health Services Division of OEO rather than Legal Services.)

Two backup centers have no university affiliation. The Migrant Legal Action Program, which developed from an earlier OEO-funded research program on migrants, is a non-profit corporation. It has a board of directors composed of members of prominent law firms in the area, lawyers concerned with the legal rights of migrants, and representatives of organizations and programs which deal in the migrants. The backup center concerned with the rights of the elderly is similarly operated by a non-profit corporation. Plans call for the Center on Social Welfare Policy and Law at Columbia University Law School to be operated by a private non-profit corporation with representatives of welfare rights organizations on the board, and for the National Consumer Law Center to be transferred to a non-profit corporation. One major disadvantage of operation of these centers at universities is the difficulty of developing structures which permit necessary input from program constituents.

The Office of Economic Opportunity describes one of the accomplishments of the Legal Services Program in this way. "Through making available basic legal research and materials appropriate for teaching purposes, they (the programs) aid in the reorientation of law school curricula toward a greater coverage of poverty law issues."

Although there is no consistent pattern of success concerning the revision of curriculae, new courses have been developed at some law schools. With the exception of the program at Columbia, staff members teach credit courses in all the programs. Several university officials mentioned that one asset of the program was that it paid salaries for experts who would not otherwise be available to

the law faculty. A considerable body of published research has been generated in the previously under-developed area of poverty law.

Nearly all the programs have involved students in their work, either on a paid basis or by assigning them research projects which earn them credit in the law school. It should be noted, however, that university sponsorship is not necessary for this kind of involvement to occur. The Director of the Migrant Legal Action Program has an arrangement with three Washington area law schools to use students in similar ways.

It was mentioned earlier that the backup center program contrasted with the Cooperative Extension Service and Sea Grant Program because of the nature of its constituency. Another major difference is that university involvement was a crucial part of the original conception of those programs. Legislation for both Cooperative Extension and Sea Grant specified that universities were to be the vehicle of program implementation. Backup centers, however, developed as a result of program needs identified by Legal Services staff, and university involvement was tangential to the purpose of the program. Little thought seems to have been given to the development of administrative structures which would allow the university and program mutually to benefit from their association. The experience of this program suggests that a university will not function at its maximum potential as a resource center for community service programs unless mechanisms are created to make this happen. Similarly, if impact on the university curriculum is intended, thought must be given to the kinds of activities which will make this occur.

The experience and approach of the Health Law Project at the University of Pennsylvania contrast sharply with the backup centers funded through Legal Services and provide further illumination about their difficulties. The primary program purpose is of direct concern to the university—"to create a set of health law teaching materials for use not only in Pennsylvania, but in law schools throughout the country . . . . The theory of the grant is that the methods ordinarily utilized by law teachers for the purpose of bringing together teaching materials are inappropriate with regard to such problems. One cannot simply cull existing cases, articles and legal writings; edit them; and set up "notes and questions," because a sufficient base of legal activity and scholarship in the health area does not exist." Clearly, the focus of the project is the development of a product of value to universities—new and more relevant teaching materials—and the rationale behind the "activist" orientation of the staff relates to education. Action is required to develop a body of knowledge which can be taught.

Program staff, in turn, have made use of university resources. The Faculty Director feels that the insights and perspective of students have been invaluable in shaping the direction of the program. He leads a Health Law Seminar which enrolls students in several different disciplines, and which solicits student opinion on major policy issues of the project.

A second issue concerns the purpose of the program. Program staff very justifiably feel that their energy and talent should be spent meeting the needs of the lawyers in the Neighborhood Legal Service offices and of the poor. Although backup center staff are keenly interested in institutional change, change in universities is not a major priority. The Cooperative Extension and Sea Grant Program both provide funds for activities which are part of the university's normal functions; there is questionable benefit to the university, however, from a program whose primary focus is completely in the community. And, from the perspective of the program staff, the university setting tends to prevent the close involvement of its constituents in program planning. Although the issue of indirect costs is the ostensible source of friction between the university and the program, in one sense that issue is symbolic and only suggests that neither university nor the Office of Economic Opportunity is getting what it wants from their association.

From its inception, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been characterized by controversy, recurrent changes in funding patterns, and rapid turnover of staff. The Division of Legal Services reflects this instability. During the past year, the Director of the Division was fired amid much newspaper publicity and there has been considerable discussion about funding all the Legal Services programs through a separate corporation. One tangible benefit of university sponsorship has been the insulation it has provided the program against political opposition and the prestige university affiliation offers. More directly, backup centers, since they are operated at universities, are not subject to the veto of the Governor.

Although there is a short-term benefit to the program in university affiliation, the issue is larger than the success of backup centers. It is significant that universities were exempted from the provision that governors have veto power over programs; they are assumed to be "value-free" and not subject to political pressures. The job of the university is not to provide political or administrative sanctuary for a program which is primarily community-oriented. If a pattern develops of controversial programs "borrowing" the prestige of the university, rather than effectively using its resources, that prestige will become of questionable value. □

# LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION: AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL CHALLENGE

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations calls the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act "an intergovernmental challenge," and notes that "most of the controversy has been over the desirability of block grants–channeling Federal funds through the States on a broad program basis–versus direct Federal grants to State agencies and localities on a project-by-project basis." Since block grants are close in philosophy and administrative structure to revenue sharing and that method of funding educational programs has been endorsed by the Administration and widely discussed, the experience of this agency may be useful in developing revenue sharing approaches.

The programs funded through this Act relate to educational issues in other more specific ways. The subject matter of crime and delinquency has not produced the same kind of rigorous scientific analysis as have other community problems, and there is little communication between practitioners in this field and university faculty. Experience of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), the agency administering this Act, has bearing on the problem of applying the resources of the university to problems which traditionally have had little appeal for the higher education community. In the case of many community service programs, university involvement is either mandated or strongly encouraged by Washington; in this program, funding decisions are made at the State and local levels. The pattern of funding suggests what help State and local officials feel the university can provide and if they, in fact, view the university as a resource at all.

A recurrent theme of this study has been consideration of ways research results can be made most effective in meeting the needs of users in the community. Research awards are made by a separate unit within LEAA, the National Institutes of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Although priorities for funding are determined at the national level, research results are assumed to be applicable at the level of program operation in States and localities. The clear dichotomy between the determination of research priorities and the use of research results poses special problems for LEAA and the educational community.

The Omnibus Crime Bill was preceeded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965, which was intended to "generate new approaches and techniques and to upgrade existing practices, resources, and capacities for dealing with the problem of crime." Under the Act, the Attorney General was empowered to make grants or contracts with public and private non-profit agencies for projects with the same general purposes as those now funded by LEAA. No formula was established for determining the allocation of these funds. The program remained relatively small, and its activities were important primarily for their emphasis on the importance of up-grading the criminal justice system.

A Presidential Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice was appointed to evaluate the nation's criminal justice system and make recommendations; the report of this group documented the existence of a badly trained, understaffed and poorly financed system. In partial response to this report the Johnson administration developed the Safe Streets and Control Act of 1967 which stipulated that States, as well as each local jurisdiction or combination of localities over 50,000 population, would be required to prepare law enforcement and criminal justice plans as a condition for receiving Federal funds. Controversy developed over the degree of involvement of the States, with the Johnson Administration taking the position that the States lacked the necessary expertise to assume a leadership role in planning.

Much of the controversy surrounding the bill involved the level of government where fund allocations would be made. The final result, after a series of amendments by Senator Dirksen, was that 85% of the annual appropriation would go to the States according to their population, with the remaining 15% to be allocated by LEAA. Forty percent of all planning funds would be funnelled through the States to units of local government, and 75% of each State's allocation would be available for action programs at the local level.

The report of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations draws attention to the most striking aspect of the program. "Safe Streets Act is a marked departure in substance and style from most other grant programs enacted by Congress during the 1960's. The most striking change is the Act's heavy reliance on State governments as planners, administrators, coordinators and innovators . . . ." Currently, funds are allocated on the basis of population to State planning agencies (SPA's) which upon consultation with local and regional units of government, develop a State plan for approval by LEAA. Each SPA is responsible to a board made up of representatives of law enforcement agencies and units of local government within the State and of public agencies maintaining programs to control and reduce crime.

The great bulk of LEAA funds are block grants awarded to SPA's for use in State programs or for distribution to local units of government; in FY 1971, $365,000,000 of a total LEAA budget of $529,000,000 was distributed through the block grant program. The National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice had a FY 1971 budget of $7,500,000. In addition to making grants for research projects, the Institute is responsible for developing techniques for evaluating all of the activities of LEAA. The Institute also funds Graduate Research Fellowships, Pilot Cities Programs, which test new techniques in criminal justice in laboratory communities, the Law Enforcement Education Program, which involves universities in upgrading criminal justice personnel, and the National Library Reference Service.

Total Federal expenditures on nine higher continuing education programs designed to ameliorate problems of crime and delinquency were $248,487,000 in FY 1970. Six of these programs, totaling $238,487,000, are administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

It is indicative of the status of education and training programs at LEAA that for most of the agency's history no one person has been responsible for relations with universities or for the development of educational and training programs. Similarly, it is extremely difficult to discover how much of LEAA's funds are going to colleges and universities. Only State and local units of government are eligible for direct funding through the block grant program; therefore, State university systems, but not private colleges and universities, may receive direct grants. Universities may contract with units of State or local government to perform a specific service or receive a sub-grant from them.

In an attempt to define the issues concerning university involvement, telephone conversations were held with staff members of ten of the State Planning Agencies, and there were two on-site visits. Since direction from the Federal level concerning the degree of kind of university involvement was not clear, the services provided by universities varied considerably from State to State. A number of SPA's had supplemented university budgets for LEEP, the Law Enforcement Education Program. Small research projects, in the area of $1,000 to $10,000 have been supported, and universities have operated training programs for criminal justice personnel in various states. Involvement ranges from the awarding of one or two small research grants to extensive use of all the various resources of the university. The Governor's Commission on Crime Prevention and Control in Minnesota has awarded over $575,000 in action funds to colleges and universities for programs ranging from "Education on Legal Procedures for Social Workers" to a "Rural Crime and Justice Institute".

Activities of the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency in New Jersey resulted in the formation of the New Jersey Council of Educational Institutions for Law Enforcement which developed a master plan for the State including guidelines which would insure quality law enforcement education programs.

Responses to a questionnaire sent to 21 of the remaining SPA's confirmed responses of the initial telephone conversations. Directors of the agencies were asked if they had a full-time staff member responsible for planning in the area of education and training and what roles the local universities had played in their program development and implementation. An open-ended question solicited reactions to the special problems and advantages involved in granting funds to universities.

All agencies had involved universities to some extent in their programs. Of the 15 respondents, the great majority indicated that universities had received contracts or sub-grants to operate training programs for personnel in the crimiial justice agencies; a total of 22 programs were described. In addition, a number of small research grants had been awarded for topics ranging from a study which will lead to recommendations concerning the total revision of the Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure to data collection analysis of the Probation Department in New Hampshire. There has been relatively little use of law schools and of the university as a vehicle to evaluate and plan programs operated by other agencies.

Although many respondents did not comment on the special problems and advantages of university involvement, one remark in particular is striking. The Deputy Director of the Governor's Commission on Crime and Delinquency in New Hampshire commented, "I find little value, to date, in university contact. Too expensive, too esoteric, – far too much interest in theory, far too little interest in reality (action). In terms of social change, I'm afraid the community passed them by some time ago. Too bad, there is so much that could be done with such resources." His views have been echoed, both in other responses to the questionnaires and in conversations. The director of one LEAA-funded program remarked that, although he had access to the resources of the entire University of California system, he had not involved any colleges or universities in his operations because he found that private consultant firms were much more capable of meeting deadlines and getting to the heart of a problem. He also felt that university faculty were extremely capable of criticizing criminal justice systems, but were unable to suggest how alternative systems could be implemented.

Conclusions concerning the involvement of SPA's were predictable. Since there was no clear directive from the Federal government concerning the role universities should play in program operation, there was a wide range in the extent and ways universities were involved by State Planning Agencies. Interestingly enough, universities were primarily called upon for their traditional role of teaching; training courses were mentioned most frequently in terms of sub-contracts awarded. In addition, there was a skepticism about whether universities had knowledge and appropriate techniques for immediate problem-solving situations.

The National Institute for Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice has an extensive and crucial role in the overall functioning of LEAA. Operating with an FY 70 budget of $7,500,000, the Institute is authorized to (1) "Sponsor and conduct research, development, testing and evaluation of new or improved systems, equipment and devices to improve and strengthen law enforcement; (2) study the causes of crime and effectiveness of crime prevention, law enforcement and correctional programs; (3) recommend actions to be taken by governments, private persons, and organizations to improve and strengthen law enforcement; (4) conduct an active program of dissemination of technical information on law enforcement; and (5) provide instructional assistance through fellowships and special workshops".

The Project Grant Program, by which the Institute funds research projects in the criminal justice field, is its largest undertaking. In FY 70 this program accounted for $5,456,000 of the total Institute budget; universities received grants totalling $1,110,000. (By grantee, universities received 23.9% of National Institute funds and were exceeded only by private firms which received 24.4%.) These percentages are based on the entire Institute budget of $7,500,000. The great extent of involvement by consultant firms in research was unexpected. One explanation made by Institute staff was that they were attempting to build resources other than the university for research work. Comments from staff on the level of program operation suggest that consultant firms have a reputation for being better able to complete projects on time and accomplish the purposes of the granting agency. In addition, consultant firms often spend considerable time establishing contacts with potential grantees and keep current about changing priorities and needs.

The kinds of projects funded show some indication of the priorities at the Institute. More than one third (37.4%) of the National Institute funds in FY 70 were spent on projects related to police equipment, techniques and systems. This program area was followed by courts and prosecution at 20% and crime prevention at 16.1%. Beyond that categorization, it is difficult to generalize about the kinds of research projects which were funded. They range from broad topics such as "A Study of Organized Crime in an Urban Area" to such specific studies as "Comparative Study of Court Calendaring Results".

An analysis of the method of setting research priorities and disseminating project results is more revealing than a simple listing of the kinds of projects funded. Intial telephone conversations with State Planning Agencies revealed that the results of research projects funded by the Institute had not been used in program planning at the State and local levels and that there had been little attempt to solicit the views of planners concerning what problems should be studied. These observations were later confirmed in replies to the questionnaire sent to State Planning Agencies. (Two respondents did mention that there had been an attempt which failed in late 1969, to form an advisory group of State Planning Agencies to communicate research needs.)

Earlier in this report, an official of the Governor's Commission on Crime and Delinquency in New Hampshire was quoted to the effect that the university showed "far too much interest in theory, far too little interest in reality (action)". The particular problems of the information system of this agency would not be of concern to this study except for their bearing on the university's ability to solve community problems. If administrative procedures are not established which permit the research needs of the community to be known and if proposed projects are evaluated only in terms of the priorities of Washington staff, the university is hampered in its ability to serve the community. There was no evidence that the staff of the Institute even consulted staff members in other programs of LEAA.

Information dissemination is as crucial to a viable research effort as is the development of relevant priorities. The problems concerning dissemination of research results are suggested by the response of one SPA to the questionnaire. "News of this kind (concerning studies) is generally received indirectly, through other state criminal justice agency newsletters". Numerous complaints were voiced, both by staffs of SPA's and of other LEAA programs, about the difficulties of locating information sources within the Institute.

The Institute has developed two techniques to promote information dissemination. Of most relevance to this study is an innovative program which developed from a demonstration project originally funded to the American Criminal Justice Institute in San Jose, California. The "Pilot Cities Program", as described in LEAA, is intended "to demonstrate the importance and practicality of comprehensive changes in law enforcement. . ." In one city of each of the LEAA regions, the Institute establishes a team that works in close cooperation with police, court and correctional agencies to identify crime problems, assesses the effectiveness of agency activities, and suggests on the basis of the best technology, programs that address critical local crime problems. Cities are chosen for the Pilot Cities Program on the basis of several criteria, including size, support of city and criminal justice leadership, the seriousness of crime problems and the receptivity to technology transfer.

Currently, there are projects operating in the following cities: Albuquerque, New Mexico; Chapel Hill, North Carolina; Dayton, Ohio; San Jose, California; Des Moines, Iowa; Williamsburg, Virginia; and Omaha, Nebraska. All but two of these programs—those at Dayton and San Jose—are funded at universities. Each program has a budget of approximately $200,000 to pay salaries for a central staff of experts in the criminal justice field. In addition, each participating city is allocated $500,000 in discretionary funds beyond its block grant monies with the assumption that the consultants will help relevant city agencies in planning the use of the funds.

Programs at universities operate in a variety of administrative arrangements. At the University of New Mexico, the program is in the Institute for Social Research and Development; at the University of North Carolina, it is in the Institute for Government; at Nebraska, in the Department of Law Enforcement and Corrections; in other cases, programs are the direct responsibility of Assistant Vice Presidents.

The programs at universities are more recent than those funded through non-profit corporations, and it is too early to evaluate their success. Experience at the University of New Mexico, however, does suggest what some of the advantages and disadvantages are of university involvement in this kind of activity. An important initial step for Pilot Cities Program staff is to gain the confidence of the criminal justice community since the influence of that staff is dependent on the extent to which relevant local agencies will accept their advice. The Program Director at Albuquerque commented that the image of the university as being too radical and theoretically oriented was an obstacle in enlisting the support of criminal justice agencies. This problem was compounded by a clash between the local police and the students over the use of a park located near the University. It is indicative of the confidence the staff had already been able to generate that they were invited by the police to observe activity in the Command Headquarters where strategy was planned to quell the disturbance.

This problem of image has been important in terms of program-university relations in two other ways. Before the program actually began operation, several members of the Sociology Department complained about the proposed grant because they felt LEAA was a "paramilitary" agency and the University would become involved in activities leading to repression. On the other hand, the Assistant Director of ISRAD commented that this particular program had been useful because ISRAD generally had a reputation of serving only the disadvantaged.

There have been considerable attempts to use the resources of the University of New Mexico in program development and implementation. The staff of the Criminal Justice Program has submitted applications to LEAA for 14 different projects which involve either departmental or faculty member participation. Involvement ranges from a simple contractual arrangement with one member of the Department of Psychiatry to the operation of a Drug Abuse Education and Coordination Center.

It is too early to measure accurately the effects of this program on the community. What does seem apparent is that the ability of the staff to function is impaired by the overall administrative problems of LEAA. Directors of Pilot Cities Programs have had no more success than Directors of State Planning Agencies in obtaining research results from the Institute, nor have they been asked to help determine research priorities. More important, perhaps, is the fact that administrative sturctures have not been developed which permit the sharing of the experiences of the staffs of Pilot Cities Programs with criminal justice planning units at the State and local levels.

It should be noted that the Institute is concerned about the problem of information dissemination and has awarded a contract of over $700,000 to General Electric for the development of a National Criminal Justice Reference Service. This contract was preceded by a planning grant to George Washington Uniersity in 1970 for a study which would identify the users to be served, define their needs, establish information resources, and determine the types of reference services to be built into the system. The Reference Service will be used by LEAA Regional Offices, State Planning Agencies, local law enforcement planning agencies, and legislators and legislative bodies.

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act has been called an "intergovernmental challenge". One of the major challenges to a program which places responsibility for planning at the State and local levels is the development of ways whereby the national pool of knowledge, in terms of research results and expertise, can be made available at the State and local levels. It is ironic that this program which stresses the determination of program priorities at the local level has concentrated the determination of research priorities in Washington. The effect of this on the university, which is one of the major repositories of knowledge, is to impair its ability to respond to community problems with relevant information.

The experience of this program also suggests that universities have developed a reputation for being able to solve some community problems, but not others. The staffs of State Planning Agencies have requested university involvement where teaching and training functions were necessary, but there is considerable skepticism about the ability of university faculty to provide guidance on immediate, practical problems and to work effectively with the criminal justice community. The Pilot Cities Program will provide a link between the academic community and the "real world", and will test whether university resources are approprite to the problems in the criminal justice field. □

# GOVERNMENT CONDUCTED PROGRAMS OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

A major responsibility of the Federal government is the dissemination of information and knowledge to the general public and to specialized clienteles. This is often done directly, without reliance upon universities as intermediaries. Consequently, many continuing education programs are conducted by Federal employees, rather than under project or formula grants. These programs differ from the vast array of Civil Service Commission and Federal agency training programs in that they are intended primarily for the public rather than for government employees.

A broad spectrum of topics is included in this grouping. Subject areas range from a Uranium Workshop, sponsored by the Atomic Energy Commission at Grant Junction, Colorado, to Agriculture Development in the Tennessee Valley, to Civil Defense Training and Education.

Of the 143 programs included in this study, eleven can be termed "government-conducted" programs. In addition to these, many workshops and training courses exist which are not included in this study because they deal with subject matter or a level of address below usual definitions of higher education. Within this broader listing would be such programs as Tax Information and Education, sponsored by the Internal Revenue Service; Weights and Measures Service, offered by the National Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce; and many others which relate to the basic responsibilities of Federal agencies.

Funds to organize and conduct these programs are provided directly by the sponsoring agency and are typically used primarily to defray the government's administrative and salary costs. Only in a very limited number of programs are funds provided for stipends or for travel expenses and living costs of participants. However variations in practice do occur. In the Model Cities Supplementary Grants Program, funds are transferred to a City Demonstration Agency (CDA) in a city which has been selected as a Model City. The CDA, therefore, acts as HUD's training agent in carrying out the program for that city. For the Civil Defense Training and Education Program, funds are assigned to the Regional Civil Defense Directors who then work with participating States in carrying out Civil Defense Education programs.

Typical of government-conducted continuing education programs are the Nuclear Education and Training activities of the Atomic Energy Commission. The clientele served through these programs is highly specialized; participants come primarily from the scientific community. The main purpose is to communicate current findings and techniques to an audience who will apply them in industry and education.

These courses are usually conducted at one of the A.E.C. laboratories. Many of the workshops and institutes are concentrated at the Argonne National Laboratory and at the Oak Ridge facility of the Atomic Energy Commission. Interested participants apply directly to the sponsoring laboratory. This procedure helps keep the administrative costs low and paper work is minimal.

None of the A.E.C. programs requires matching funds by the participant or his employer. For some programs, fees are paid by participants on a set scale, but two of the six A.E.C. programs offer financial assistance to the participant. For example, the Faculty Research Participation program provides a monthly stipend for periods of from two months to a full year (not to exceed $1,200 per month) based on the academic level of the faculty participant.

One advantage of placing the responsibility for the educational programs at the laboratory level is the resulting flexibility. Workshops can be arranged as the need arises; communication is simplified between participant and sponsor. In FY 1970, $1,818,000 was assigned directly for these A.E.C. continuing education programs and over 1,100 persons participated.

Another area in which the government-sponsored program concept is being used successfully is in the training of public health workers. The Center for Disease Control (DHEW) in Atlanta was allotted $1,481,000 for FY 1970 to assist States in developing and strengthening their own training programs in this field. Most of the training was

done at the Center, but other institutions or regional offices were eligible co-sponsors. As in the A.E.C. programs, funds were used primarily for administrative costs. The participating State is required to provide training space, equipment and fees for any local speakers.

Coordination and cooperation with land grant colleges is an important factor in the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority's programs. Here, farmers are the direct recipients of research sponsored by the TVA in conjunction with State Extension Services. Programs are focused on the immediate dissemination of relevant research findings to the farmers. Approximately $1,000,000 was provided for these programs in FY 1970.

While government-conducted continuing education efforts vary widely in subject matter, the kinds of clientele served and in the administrative arrangements through which they operate, they have several common characteristics. Where a Federal agency is a "producer" of knowledge, it has a responsibility to share that knowledge more broadly. When primary expertise (such as in Civil Defense) is concentrated within, rather than outside, the Federal government, it is reasonable for government to conduct educational programs directly. And in situations where specialized facilities and equipment of the highest order exist within government (nuclear equipment, for example), it is logical and often necessary to bring trainees to the government facility. □

# HIGH EXPECTATIONS AND MODEST SUCCESS: TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

In late 1965, Title I of the Higher Education Act was enthusiastically welcomed by colleges and universities eager to expand their continuing education programs to serve important public goals. During the intervening years much of this enthusiasm has waned for reasons which warrant careful scrutiny. Instead of becoming the central and seminal statute undergirding continuing education and general extension programs, Title I has been permitted to languish at a low plateau of funding while subsequently enacted programs of lesser scope and narrow purpose have encroached on its objectives, warped its impact and attracted higher budgets. Although Title I is a single and relatively small program among the many Federal programs reviewed in this study, its potential for the future is still powerful and attainable. It remains a legislative model of high promise: the neglect and the misunderstandings which have marked its history in no way diminish this fact. To the contrary, the essential structure and purpose of Title I are more vital and important today than when it was conceived and created.

Essentially, Title I is a formula grant program which permits and encourages States to develop plans for the application of the resources of higher education in ways which serve critical community needs. Once these plans are prepared by State agencies in collaboration with institutions of higher education and approved by the Office of Education, a series of project grants, consistent with State plans, are made to those colleges and universities which conduct the specific community service programs under funds distributed by the States. Thus, Title I has created an operative system within each State which brings educational institutions into a dialogue with the responsible State agency and with each other, for the purpose of seeking agreement on a State Plan and an acceptable division of funds and responsibility for meeting Plan objectives. In essence, this operative model offers an existing and tested format for revenue sharing within a specific and manageable sphere of activity. The broad program purposes are set by Federal legislation; the specific decisions on fund disbursement are made within the States and geared to the priority needs of each State.

Legitimate controversy exists on the broad concept of revenue sharing, and cogent reasons for this controversy have been adduced and debated. At the same time, if serious attempts are to be made to resolve this controversy, Title I offers an experimental and pragmatic way of testing one revenue sharing approach: use of Federal funds by States in support of continuing education for community service. An expanded infusion of Federal funds into Title I programs, followed by objective evaluation in depth of results achieved, could do much to produce learnings and precedents applicable in other functional areas. Some of the uncertainties of revenue sharing which now produce polemics based on assumptions rather than experience could well be resolved through a decision to use Title I as a testing ground for revenue sharing concepts.

The success of Title I to date has been marred by many factors; hence its substantial achievements have been obscured and diminished. The principal limitation has always been a funding level wholly inadequate for attaining the objectives prescribed by law. In sweeping statutory terms, Title I programs were designed to cope with problems of poverty, housing, government, health and many others which demand attention at local and national levels. An allotment of 9.5 million dollars, distributed among 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam and the Virgin Islands obviously results in dollar fragmentation which precludes funding and operation of large-scale programs. Unlike other formula grant programs—Cooperative Extension and the Sea Grant Program for example—Title I funds are not allotted to a limited number of specifically designated institutions. For example, in fiscal year 1970, a total of 501 colleges and universities operated programs under Title I funds, which indicates both the broad involvement of higher education and the further fragmentation of funds into small sums adequate only for projects of short duration or limited objectives. While the sum total of these scattered projects reveals many successful efforts which bring returns far exceeding the

modest expenditures, the vast number of project activities and of institutions and communities involved makes a systematic evaluation of Title I activities virtually impossible, unless a major effort for this purpose is organized and funded.

In addition, the objective of creating an extensive State-wide system for community service through use of higher educational resources is inhibited because the funds available do not permit involvement of many additional institutions which express interest and propose relevant projects. The anamoly is this: the extensive institutional participation which already exists results in excessive fragmentation of funds; at the same time, low funding levels prevent formulation of State plans which can involve all institutions having a capacity to contribute.

Related also to the low funding level for Title I is its lack of organizational visibility within the Office of Education. In the competition for attention from the power centers of OE, the billion dollar programs obviously command choice staff resources, locations well up in the organizational hierarchy and the personal involvement of senior-most decision-makers. By OE standards, Title I is a "small change" program, and unless such programs are exceptionally popular with Congress or the White House they tend to lose their identity and their internal support. On the other hand, the experience of this Council in gaining necessary access to the Commissioner and his Deputies on the operation of Title I has been an entirely wholesome one and the resultant dialogues have been constructive and concrete.

In another vein, the very operation of Title I through the Office of Education poses inherent problems. The substantive programs resulting from Title I funds deal with urban affairs, poverty, environmental protection and other matters outside the functional scope and jurisdiction of the Office of Education and well within the areas of concern of other major departments and agencies. The Office of Education lacks staff expertise in these program areas: its functions are education and the educational system. To some extent, OE has made efforts to lessen this difficulty by seeking program cooperation with other departments, such as Housing and Urban Development, where joint financial and staff resources can be brought to bear on a given area of functional concern. More such arrangements need to be developed and given practical effect. Yet in the final analysis, it is unlikely that OE staffing patterns and basic missions can attract to that agency persons knowledgeable in the functional outputs of universities, rather than in the educational process *per se.*

For this reason, Title I is among only a handful of OE programs dealing with socio-economic or scientific subjects. Most such educational programs are located in those agencies where a close functional kinship exists between the mission of the agency and the purpose of the program. However, even among those functional programs currently located within OE, little has been done to coordinate or consolidate them with Title I activities. For example, two programs enacted recently, the Drug Abuse Education Act and the Environmental Education Act, could effectively operate through the extensive structure established by Title I in each State. Instead, this existing structure has been by-passed and entirely new and duplicative arrangements have been made to channel these program funds to States and educational institutions. The administrative reasons for doing this seem more related to bureaucratic "ownership" of programs, rather than to cost efficiency or effectiveness of service to the public and to higher education.

A frequently-voiced criticism of Title I operations is that because State universities often serve as the State agencies through which program funds are disbursed within the State, other private or publicly supported institutions are consequently disadvantaged. No concerted attempt in this study has been made to explore this criticism, since under Section 107 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 the Commissioner of Education has ample powers to oversee the operation of State plans and their equitable administration. Our general impression, however, is that participation of 501 institutions in the program offers some testimony that funds are being shared broadly and that legitimate as well as irresponsible charges are typically levied against whatever mechanism for fund disbursement is established. In addition, most State Title I Advisory Councils are broadly representative of educational institutions and they influence and oversee the decisions of the State agency so that internal safeguards are built into the fund disbursement process.

As a result, our opinion is that criticisms along these lines, if valid, should be made to the Commissioner of Education, whose final decision is, by law, contestable in the Federal courts. These legal guarantees of equitable operation of Title I programs appear to us both reasonable and sufficient. They provide clear avenues for resolving genuine grievances and broader knowledge of their existence might do much to avert capricious grievances.

Basic institutional involvement in Title I program activities most frequently occurs through University Schools of Extension and Continuing Education or the Evening Divisions of colleges. The Higher Education Act itself specifies that: "Where course offerings are involved, such courses must be university extension or continuing education courses. . . ." This legal stipulation resulted from a legislative history in which a basic and original intent was the strengthening of the continuing education function of colleges and universities. To this basic purpose was added a community service role as the focal point of program activity. These two cardinal purposes for the most part blend well, since community service has typically been a main charge and a central responsibility of the continuing education activities of colleges and universities.

The legal assignment of Title I program activities to the extension and continuing education arms of colleges and universities has many natural advantages and some inherent disadvantages in achieving most effectively the objectives of community service. Where the Schools of Extension and Continuing Education are large and well-staffed, they are able to satisfy program requirements

through their own faculties and resources. In other instances, these schools are able to draw successfully upon excellent faculty resources from other schools and departments within their university to conduct continuing education programs requiring special forms of expertise and knowledge. In many instances, the extension divisions of colleges and universities have formed consortia to pool their resources for joint efforts which might otherwise be beyond the capacity of a single institution. This healthy trend toward formation of consortia has many beneficial side effects and has created new institutional strengths and capacities used for purposes other than Title I activities.

However, some institutions with limited extension resources and faculty strengths either cannot or do not draw upon intra- or inter-institutional support. They tend to reflect an "ownership" of Title I monies which precludes sharing these funds outside the extension and continuing education orbit of their institution, with the result that quality of project performance may tend to suffer. We regard such situations as common enough to warrant comment, but by no means typical nor wholly unjustified. In many institutions the total funds available for extension and continuing education activities are at such minimal levels that even the small sums available through Title I are of vital importance to the survival and development of extension activities; hence sharing these funds more broadly would result in a severe weakening of extension functions. Such weakening might be a greater loss in both immediate and long-range terms than the dilution in the quality of programs which results from a more narrow involvement of faculty resources.

Finally, Title I is often subjected to criticism because its broad legislative language denies its programs a sharp focus or a unifying set of functional objectives. Partly this results from low funding levels which make it impossible to serve well all the objectives set by the statute–hence perceptive selection of program priorities becomes more essential. While still providing States the essential ability to select and define their own priority needs, the Office of Education has wisely begun efforts to provide more guidance and focus for development of State plans. These OE efforts are still in early stages of implementation, but promise to help significantly in imparting the kinds of common denominators needed to focus resources on the more critical problems and thereby give Title I programs a better sense of unity and cohesion.

In sum, Title I has created a working network for involving States, communities and higher education in common efforts directed toward community problem-solving. This network is a valuable asset, not only for Title I, but as a vehicle through which other community-oriented programs of education, research and extension can be channeled. The major needs for the future are to use this network more broadly by channeling other related programs through it; to fund these programs at levels which will permit a substantial impact on objectives; and to give participating institutions assurances of long-term funding which will enable them to commit resources and develop programs having stability, permanence and long-range objectives. □



ED1
102

## APPENDIX B

# A REPORT
# ON THE COMMUNITY SERVICE
# AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAM
# (TITLE I, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965)

**FISCAL YEAR 1971**

**TO**

**THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON**
**EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION**

103
S01

# TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| The People Served | 101 |
| The National Purpose | 101 |
| Administration of the Program | 102 |
| The Continuing Education Process | 102 |
| Community Education and Community Problems | 103 |
| General Developments – Fiscal Year 1971 | 105 |
| Colleges and Universities Participating | 106 |
| Financing the Program | 106 |
| Conclusion | 107 |


# LIST OF TABLES


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Distribution of CSCE Projects Completed, In Progress, and Planned in FY 1970 and FY 1971 | 108 |
| 2. | Disposition of Institutional Proposals for CSCE Projects in FY 1971 | 108 |
| 3. | Number of Projects by Geographic Area Served | 108 |
| 4. | Distribution of Federal Funds by Geographic Area Served | 109 |
| 5. | Number of State Approved Projects by Problem Area | 109 |
| 6. | Distribution of Federal and Local Program Funds for State Approved Projects by Problem Area | 110 |
| 7. | Number and Type of Participating Institutions | 110 |
| 8. | Distribution of Federal Program Funds by Type of Participating Institution | 111 |
| 9. | Source of Matching Funds for CSCE Projects Completed in FY 1971 | 111 |
| 10. | Federal Allotments by State for Fiscal Year 1971 | 112 |

# A Report on Community Service and Continuing Education Programs (Under Title I, HEA of 1965)

## Fiscal Year 1971

The basic mission of the Community Service and Continuing Education Program is to implement the concept of education as a continuing, life-long and dynamic process through which adults can lead more meaningful and useful lives and through which concerned communities can improve their functioning.

*THE PEOPLE SERVED*

Carl, who has spent the past 15 years in and out of prison in West Virginia, wants to go back – as a civilian counselor. He "got his head together" and finished three years of high school and started college courses – all in two years. Carl is now enrolled at Bethany College which gave him the chance to continue his education and set a career goal.

Alicia and Rene with their two children spend three and sometimes four nights a week learning English in a crowded store-front center in Chicago named *Aqui Estoy* ("Here I am"). Most of the other parents in the program, like the Maldonados, are between 20 and 30 years old and recently arrived from Puerto Rico, Mexico, or Central America. They give up three or four nights a week after working eight to 10 hours a day in a factory to come to the center because they must learn new mores, new languages ". . . for their future, for their jobs, and to better their families."

Home television viewers, adult education classes and other students have voted, by a narrow margin, to allow Atlantic Canning, Inc. to build a plant near the fictitious town of Freeboro, Maine. The voters numbering more than 6,000 were participants in a five-part TV series entitled "North of the Namaskiag." Now that a decision has been reached, a Maine Town Meeting of the Air will involve participants in a continuing discussion of environmental and community problems.

John has recently received a loan from the Small Business Administration to enter the retail clothing business. The course work and consultation provided by Washington University's special program for black entrepreneurs will help Mr. A. succeed. Some 50 minority businessmen are being served and they will play an important part in maintaining the economy of the community.

These individuals were among the 305,289 beneficiaries of higher continuing education in 584 projects supported in 48 states through community service and continuing education grants under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. In addition, it is estimated that more than one-half million people were served through the use of mass media-radio, television and publications.

The majority of projects focused on a well defined target population. In Texas, for example, the program concentrated on state and local government officials and employees. The small businessman was the prime participant in Birmingham, Mobile and Montgomery. In a dozen California cities disadvantaged adults – most frequently minority group members – were the major beneficiaries of the program.

In New York, a consortium of four colleges conducted two, ten-week leadership development workshops for board members of inner city community organizations. One hundred sixty nine men and women participated in the sessions. The majority of participants were between the ages of 21 and 35. They were generally junior and senior high school graduates and most were semi-skilled workers. In this project, the need was evident and the objectives were appropriate to the defined target audience.

Thus, the Community Service and Continuing Education Program is aiding the process of *community problem solving through continuing education* of individuals, groups, and whole communities.

*THE NATIONAL PURPOSE*

The Congress set forth the goal of the Program, Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-329), as:

*Assisting the people of the United States in the solution of community problems... by making grants to strengthen the community service programs of colleges and universities.*

In other words, this Federal program supports colleges and communities in the development of educational activities for adults that contribute to the amelioration of national problems, be they social, economic or political, as these problems are manifest in American communities.

## *ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM*

The CSCE Program (Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965) is administered at three levels. The Office of Education is responsible for overall administration. The designated State agencies determine State priorities, select projects to be supported and oversee State program plans for community service and continuing education. And institutions of higher education carry out the educational projects.

Federal funds are distributed to the States on a formula basis after annual plans are approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. Federal funds are alloted with a basic amount of $100,000 to the 50 States and the District of Columbia, and $25,000 each to American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The balance of each year's appropriation is distributed on the basis of total resident population within each jurisdiction. One-third of the annual program costs must be met with non-Federal funds. The program is operative in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

## *THE CONTINUING EDUCATION PROCESS*

The figures presented in later sections of this report on dollars expended and institutions participating in the CSCE program reflect the absolute increases in State and institutional efforts, but do not present a picture of the continuing educational processes at work.

Dynamic changes in career patterns, the increasing rate at which vocational and professional skills become obsolete, new problems created by the accelerating process of urbanization, major shifts in social values and the crisis of confidence in most social institutions make it mandatory that our colleges and universities find the best ways to focus their unique resources upon the educational needs and interests of today's decision makers and a wide variety of adult citizens.

The following examples serve as illustrations of innovative continuing education projects which are being supported under Title I of the Higher Education Act.

## *PARAPROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL IN COMMUNITY AGENCIES*

New York City Community College has recently graduated 111 adults from a 60-hour program for 26 poverty and community agencies in the borough of Brooklyn. This continuing education program was specially designed to upgrade the skills of paraprofessional counselors and support personnel. The program included field supervision and classroom instruction.

This group of adults, 49 men and 62 women, were generally high school graduates, with only 11 individuals indicating any college level experience.

In the view of agency supervisors, these mature students have improved their ability to work with clients and are better able to provide quality case recording. With new knowledge and skill, these individuals are more self-confident as well as more productive. One evidence of improved job performance is the fact that one-quarter of the group received promotions after successfully completing the training program. The interest in continuing to learn was also fostered and several participants are now enrolled part-time at the City University of New York.

In Fiscal Year 1971, fifteen similar projects were begun in twelve states. These projects are directed to paraprofessionals in a variety of community-serving agencies. The States anticipate the enrollment of 7,000 paraprofessionals in these programs.

## *CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR WOMEN*

Through a counseling and guidance center for mature women, 431 women in the Piedmont region of North Carolina have developed specific plans for personal growth and future activity. A comprehensive series of educational and vocational counseling services have been developed by the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, and are being provided to 125 women who wish to re-enter full or part-time employment.

The Center's program includes a 12-week seminar, a study skills clinic and an employment skills clinic. Employment surveys and information workshops are conducted on a regular schedule. The exploration of volunteer opportunities has been extensive and the Center works with a variety of agencies and organizations in the utilization of the well trained volunteer.

Equally inventive programs for women are being conducted in Arkansas, Delaware, Iowa, Pennsylvania, South Carolina and Wisconsin. Some 5,000 women, young and mature, black and white, will be participating. These programs reflect the mounting interest in the problems of women and concern for the role that education plays in a constantly changing society.

In addition, numerous projects in the several States are directed to nurses, teachers, medical secretaries and to other occupational groups which are largely composed of women at the present time.

*MINORITY BUSINESSMEN*

Georgetown University in the District of Columbia developed new courses and new approaches to instruct operating and prospective small business managers. Such entrepreneurs frequently lack basic managerial skills in accounting, inventory control, merchandising and sales promotion. Forty-one men and six women attended a two-hour class once a week for six months and had individual sessions with faculty members from American, Georgetown and Howard Universities. Established businessmen in the local area have also served as advisors to aspiring black businessmen engaged in this continuing education project.

In addition to upgrading knowledge and skills of the participants, the project produced significant alterations at the institutions of higher education. Two new courses were initiated at Georgetown: "Marketing in the Inner-City" and "The City in Fact and Fiction." Howard University established a new course entitled "Black Economic Development."

As a result of this pioneering effort, a similar project is being conducted, with other Federal funding, for the Redevelopment Land Agency. Discussions are underway with the Federal Aviation Administration for the extension of the program to small contractors.

Projects of this nature are being conducted in thirteen additional States: Alabama, Connecticut, Michigan, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Tennessee, New Jersey, Illinois, Indiana, Mississippi, North Carolina and Ohio. More than 2,300 minority businessmen are engaged in these programs.

*THE AGING POPULATION*

A "Senior Citizen Program" at Quinnipiac College in Connecticut was aimed at two related but distinct problems for the older American: the need to know and the need to serve. The two-part project involved almost 400 men and women in the communities of Cheshire, Hamden and North Haven. In addition to lecture-discussions on such areas as Social Security, wills and the psychology of aging, the sessions dealt with the programs and functions of Senior Citizen Centers in the three communities. A smaller group entered into consultation with the Volunteer Service Bureau and is finding ways and means of putting newly gained knowledge and skills to more effective use in community-serving organizations.

Eleven projects in eight other States are currently serving the educational needs of more than 3,000 older citizens. The "Senior Citizen Resource Center" at the University of Nevada and a pilot "Life Enrichment Program" from the University of South Carolina are but two examples of innovative approaches to the wide-spread concern for the aging population.

*INMATES OF PENAL INSTITUTIONS*

Other segments of the population are being served where the need is great and when resources are available. Not the least of these is the State prison population which has recently received national attention. The CSCE Program provides the only Federal assistance now available to meet the higher continuing education needs of this group in our society.

An experimental project in West Virginia was conducted at Moundsville State Prison by Bethany College. Of the 133 inmates participating in the educational program, 79 have been released. Eight of these men are now enrolled in college. Only eight (10%) of the 79 persons released have been returned to prison for parole violations. This recidivism rate is far below the national average of 25 percent.

From the documented evidence it is clear that higher continuing education supported under Title I is making a significant contribution to both individual success and societal achievement. A few of the overlooked continuing education needs of neglected adults are being served, and as a result, the quality of life for individuals and societies is being enhanced.

*COMMUNITY EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY PROBLEMS*

The Community Service and Continuing Education Program springs from the imperative to use higher education as a national resource in developing a sound urban society. Communities – social, political and geographic–are faced with a vast array of physical and human conditions that require college-community cooperation in the task of ameliorating community problems. The overall process is one referred to as community education.

Community education means developing community awareness about community problems, enhancing the skills of problem analysis, identifying alternative methods of attack and selecting the most promising educational strategies for alleviating the problem. The development of such educational strategies is being accomplished by colleges and universities in concert with State and local governments, volunteer organizations and new combinations of community members.

From this perspective the CSCE Program represents a continuing concern on the part of the Federal government for supporting community-wide education related to the most pressing public problems. Within the broad framework of problem areas listed in the enabling legislation, special attention was given in 1971 to environmental quality, Model Cities efforts, drug abuse, crime and youth opportunities.

The following projects illustrate the viability of joint college-community endeavors in these areas:

*THE 8TH DAY*

The Puget Sound Coalition, a voluntary association of colleges, universities* and community organizations, has developed a workable discussion/action model for citizen involvement in environmental issues.

The Coalition, in cooperation with KING Broadcasting Company of Seattle, produced eight films focusing on the environmental quality of the Puget Sound region. The television-film series covered population, land and space, institutions and values, social welfare, economy, ecology, and public policy.

More than 400 learning groups, involving some 5,000 individuals, were organized to participate actively in the project. These listening-learning groups were developed in cooperation with the Washington League of Women Voters, the Washington Council of PTA's and various church organizations.

The university coalition employed Title I, HEA funds for general coordination of the project, organization of the discussion/action groups, research, and preparation of discussion materials including the basic text entitled *Quality of Life.* This learning manual provided an overview of the subject areas, assignments and reality quizzes. Group assignments were designed to give participants first-hand knowledge of local conditions and to develop a commitment to the solution of common problems.

KING Broadcasting Company won national awards from the *Saturday Review* for the best use of television in a local community and from Sigma Delta Chi for the best community documentary presented as a public service.

This community education project continues to create an impact with revised materials, a larger number of participants, the rebroadcast of video tapes by station KING and educational television stations in the southern part of the State, and the organization of new groups of active citizens.

Program costs were provided by Title I, HEA ($87,000), colleges and universities ($67,000), and station KING ($50,000).

The successful design and implementation of this broadcast/discussion/action model commends its refinement and replication in other regions of the country.

*DRUG ABUSE – YOUR COMMUNITY PROBLEM*

In Maryland a community-oriented drug education project employed similar techniques, i.e. the broadcast/discussion/action model.

The Maryland Council for Community Services, composed of eleven community colleges and the University of Maryland, initiated a long-range project in cooperation with the State Drug Abuse Authority to present factual drug information as a step toward community action on this critical social issue.

The three-phased project included:

1. A series of seminars on the campuses of eleven community colleges.

2. A three-hour audience-participation broadcast entitled "If Drugs are the Answer, What's the Question?" on TV station WMPB and simultaneous broadcast on 13 radio stations.

3. Eleven 30-minute films developed by the State Department of Education for further public education via three television stations, for in-school programs, and for specially organized adult groups throughout the State.

As a result of the development of this model public education program, specific groups of drug abusers, parents, students and agency personnel have been identified as targets for more narrowly focused continuing education activities.

*PICO-UNION NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL*

The Pico-Union neighborhood of Los Angeles is a mixed residential/commercial area with a population of about 11,000 persons. Sixty percent of the residents are Spanish-speaking and 30 percent are Black. This poverty pocket was designated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development as an urban renewal area. The collective judgment was that the area's residents had little civic awareness and possessed no viable organizational structure to deal effectively with community development and physical renewal.

With the assistance of a Title I grant, The University of California at Los Agneles negotiated a teaching/consultation agreement with the neighborhood council to aid in (1) improving the organizational strength of the council, (2) initiating a broad community education program, and (3) providing technical assistance in community organization, economic development, housing, planning and education. The project helped to generate responsible community involvement and was instrumental in securing non-government funding for the council. More than 900 citizens of the area learned how to define problems, identify resources, analyze alternative courses of action and implement plans. University faculty acted as resource persons for citizen task forces and helped to build a more sophisticated community leadership group. Basic to the educational endeavor was the University's decision not to become a social service agency nor to duplicate the functions of existing agencies. With the faculty in a teacher-consultant role, the citizens acquired new knowledge for better decision making and developed the skills necessary for maintaining a valid community organization.

The project was a success. Urban renewal is progressing with the active participation of the community's residents. The results also indicate that in-depth education of a community helps public and private agencies to view such a low-income minority as less threatening than in cases where higher continuing education resources are not

*Seattle University, Western Washington State College, Pacific Lutheran University, University of Puget Sound, and Tacoma Community College.

employed. The project has demonstrated the ability of a community—through education—to responsibly assume control of many aspects of its governance. Although Federal support for this 30-month project has ended, university resources will continue to be employed to assist a non-profit community corporation in sponsoring low to moderate income housing and in designing vest-pocket parks.

UCLA, having reached the specific objective of this project, has moved to apply the experience gained in Pico-Union to the community of Venice.

*THE TEXAS ASSEMBLY*

To improve the problem-solving ability of State and local governments, the University of Texas in partnership with the Texas Urban Development Commission, and supported by a Title I grant, developed a two-year research, education and action project. About 250 community and business leaders were the target group of learners.

Six faculty members worked full-time to collect and analyze data on the State's urban areas in relation to traffic, pollution, housing, crime and central city decay. The staff provided support to the Commission's twelve working committees in translating proposals into substantive legislation and in devising strategies for informing the electorate of the State.

The Commission's Report entitled *Toward Urban Progress* was favorably presented to the Governor and the legislature in early December, 1970. Later that month the Texas Assembly, composed of 80 opinion leaders, met to assess the actions that might be taken. The Assembly's report entitled *Urban Texas Tomorrow* was given wide circulation and formed the basis for public discussion in nearly all the cities of the State.

With the convening of the 62nd legislature in Texas, substantive legislative action was taken on recommendations of the Commission and the Assembly. Among these actions were:

1. Establishment of an official State policy toward urban development.
2. Creation of a new State Department of Community Affairs.
3. Authorization for a broad range of intergovernmental contracting among all local governments.
4. Establishment of new procedures for setting and enforcing standards governing the manufacture and sale of mobile homes.
5. Creation of an interim House Committee to study higher minimum training requirements for peace officers.
6. Amendments of the State's voter registration procedures.
7. Authorization for the formation of a State Development Credit Corporation.

Many more college-community projects were conducted to focus the resources of higher education on groups of citizens who have a critical role to play in the community problem-solving process and on the general public whose awareness of problems is necessary if changes are to occur. Men and women in all age categories and with varied educational backgrounds came together to learn together and to act together in the interest of their communities.

*GENERAL DEVELOPMENTS*

State Programs of Community Service and Continuing Education when viewed as an entity, i.e., a national program, have made significant progress toward the goals of the enabling legislation.

The fifty-four State agencies provide an important demonstration of the viability of State planning and State administration of continuing education in relation to priority problems of national concern.

Data presented in this section were obtained from Annual Program Reports and Financial Statements submitted by the States for Fiscal Year 1971.

A total of 1,566 educational projects in 48* States constituted current community education operations during Fiscal Year 1971. A total of 815 projects were "in progress" at the end of the Fiscal Year and 143 (compared with 184 in FY 1970) were "planned" with implementation scheduled within the next year. Twenty-four projects were cancelled, most as a result of the loss of the project director. The status of current Federally supported projects is shown in Table 1.

The 584 projects reported as "completed" during FY 1971 accounted for 37.8% of all project activity. Slightly more than 40% are being continued in FY 1972 with Federal funds while 16% are being refunded from non-Federal sources. Some examples of information gained from these projects follows.

Direct instruction, i.e., courses, seminars, workshops, and conferences, contituted 64.8% of all educational activity. Technical assistance and consultation accounted for 15.9%. The remainder of the activity consisted of research, information dissemination, and multi-media presentations.

Forty-six States reported that 252 of their completed projects were directed at areas of special concern: 183 projects were involved in a wide variety of "inner-city" problems; 26 were environmental education; 27 were connected with Model Cities programs; and 16 were drug abuse education projects.

The same States reported 154 projects designed to continue the education of members of minority groups. Eighty-six projects had black Americans as participants, and they constituted more than 61% of the total 39,190 minority group participants. Spanish-surnamed Americans and American Indians took part in 10 and 9 projects,

*Annual reports were not received in sufficient time for inclusion in this report from: Illinois, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, and Vermont.

respectively. Forty-nine projects involved a cross-section of minority participants.

Two hundred and twenty-five projects utilized 9,799 students as resource personnel. Research and data collection were the most frequently reported student activity with technical assistance/consultation a close second.

Thirty-nine States reported that 3,306 faculty members had been involved, for varying amounts of time, in community service and continuing education activities that ranged in length from one day to eighteen months. Few (7%) spent more than half their time on the projects. Most (69%) devoted less than a quarter of their time.

In addition to monitoring and assessing on-going and completed projects, the State agencies in FY 1971, continued to refine State plans and increased program development efforts in reviewing and approving project proposals.

The forty-eight States that reported received 1,093 proposals. Six hundred were not funded: 76 because they did not fall within state priorities; 186 because of various inadequacies; and 338 because of insufficient funds. The volume of institutional proposals for continuing education is shown in Table 2.

Forty-two of the 48 States reported continuing consultation with institutions about alternate sources of Federal funds for projects that could not be funded under Title I. The States provided specific information on State and Federal programs, referred proposals to other sources and assisted institutions of higher education in the development of complementary projects to be submitted to private funding sources.

State agencies, with assistance from the U.S. Office of Education, made progress toward the development of State-wide programs of continuing education. In the distribution of FY 1971 funds the States report the continued emphasis on urban areas with an increase in "comprehensive" projects that encompass larger areas and include suburban and rural areas as well as the inner city. The distribution of projects by geographic area served is shown in Table 3.

The amount of Federal funds for proposed projects correlated positively with the geographic area served. In 1971, 56 percent of the funds were for projects in urban and suburban areas, 10 percent for rural projects and the remainder (35 percent) were for comprehensive projects frequently on a state-wide basis. The distribution of Federal funds for Fiscal Years 1968-1971 is shown in Table 4.

The enabling legislation sets forth nine broad areas of community concern. To these the States have added the areas of community development, human relations, education, economic development and personal development. While community problems seldom fit neatly into any of the categories mentioned, the categories serve to identify the central or primary concern of each project. Thus projects are reported in the several categories in terms of the major area of concern. The distribution of projects approved and funded in FY 1971 by problem area is shown in Tables 5 and 6.

Of the projects reported as "completed" in FY 1971, 46 percent were directed to areas of special concern: *environmental quality, drug abuse, Model Cities* and other *inner city problems*.

In the conduct of projects during the year, there was a significant growth in the number and type of inter-institutional arrangements; i.e., multi-institutional resources focused on a clearly defined problem area.

Higher education institutions continued to bring educational resources closer to the people through the establishment of off-campus learning centers. The total of such centers reached 64 in Fiscal Year 1971.

In summary, the national program has continued to develop the community-servicing capability of colleges and universities. More institutional resources–faculty and student–have been applied to the continuing education needs of adult citizens.

Even in a period of severe financial restraints, colleges and communities have secured funds to supplement their Title I grants in order to carry out a number of projects that are having and will have significant impact on the process of community problem-solving.

## *COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES PARTICIPATING*

In Fiscal Year 1971, some 30 percent of the eligible institutions of higher education in the several states provided continuing educational services to their communities with Title I support. Increased inter-institutional cooperation through consortium arrangements among public and private colleges added thirty-five institutions to the list of those actively involved.

A total of 536 institutions were productively engaged in the development and conduct of community service and continuing education programs. Public colleges and universities (66%) continue to provide the greater proportion of institutional resources and expend the major share of federal funds (75%).

Over time there has been a steady increase in the number of 4-year private institutions in the program. Private institutions account for 34% of the institutions participating in Fiscal Year 1971.

During the year, two-year college participation increased from 9.3 percent to 9.9 percent of total institutional involvement. Tables 7 and 8 show the number of institutions and the distribution of Federal funds by type of institution for Fiscal Years 1968-1971.

## *FINANCING THE PROGRAM*

Institutions of higher education continue to provide the major share of local dollars to match the Federal investment in the CSCE program. In Fiscal Year 1971, the states, local communities, colleges and universities provided $6.3 million to match $8.4 million in Federal funds to

finance 545 projects. The States also provided $460,000 to match $900,000 in Federal funds for administration of the program. In sum, the States and institutions of higher education invested $2.1 million beyond the required match of one local dollar for every two federal dollars. (Federal allotments by State for Fiscal Year 1971 are shown in Table 10).

For the projects reported as "completed" in Fiscal Year 1971, matching funds were provided in 79.6% of the projects by institutions of higher education. Funds supplied by State and local governments were the main source of matching dollars in 11.5% of the projects. (Sources of matching funds are shown in Table 9).

The data presented above reflect only projects that have been funded with Federal support. Of equal or greater concern are those university and college proposals which could not be supported for lack of funds. The States report receipt of an additional 338 viable projects requiring an additional $7 million in Federal funds that would have made significant contributions to the attainment of State program goals. Further, the States could have used $4.94 million more to provide adequate support of the 493 approved projects.

*CONCLUSION*

The national program of Community Service and Continuing Education made measured progress toward the goal of community problem-solving through continuing education. The number of institutions of higher education participating in the program increased from 501 in FY 1970 to 531 in FY 1971. The contributions of new institutions were made possible by the continued growth of consortia-type arrangements. In such arrangements several colleges share human and physical resources to meet a mutual educational objective.

Furthermore, State administrative structures have been established that now constitute a reservoir of educational expertise that could be employed to coordinate the planning and administration of a number of Federal programs that have related goals and objectives. To the extent that such coordination is possible under existing statutes, it is being tested in a large number of States.

During Fiscal Year 1971, data collection methods were improved and early estimates have been replaced with more accurate State and institutional records on adult participants in the Program. Thus, the Office of Education has embarked on a course to improve program reporting and to provide more assistance to the States in program development and evaluation.

The number of institutional projects funded in 1971 was reduced from 610 to 545, a reduction which provided modest increases in the support given to selected projects that focus on national priorities. The short-term information sessions are decreasing in frequency and are being replaced by more comprehensive multi-media instructional programs for specific target groups.

From the plans, proposals and projects that have been developed under Title I of the Higher Education Act, it is clear that no other program provides comparable support for the college-level continuing education needs of significant segments of the adult population. This program has, within available resources, demonstrated the efficacy of many new approaches to continuing education for such diverse groups as local government officials, the aging, minority group members, prison inmates and women. These activities have served to indicate the serious need for increased Federal support of expanded continuing education opportunities for a wide variety of adult citizens.

Further analysis of the CSCE Program over a five-year span reveals that continuing education for community problem-solving is best achieved by involving particular groups of individuals who can influence change. The several states have identified specific target groups whose continuing education needs relate to such priority problems as environmental quality, drug abuse, Model Cities, and the improvement of State and local governmental services. Increasing numbers of projects are being proposed by colleges and universities to educate these groups and thus to assist in the process of community problem-solving.

These assuring signs of steady maturation of the Community Service and Continuing Education Program hold great hope for the eventual recognition by most of our colleges and universities that the continuing education of today's adult decision-makers is as important to a healthy society as the sound academic preparation of tomorrow's leaders. □

## Table 1. Distribution of Community Service and Continuing Education Projects Completed, in Progress, and Planned in FY 1970 and 1971 (By Fiscal Year of Funding)

| Reporting Year | Completed (fiscal years) | | | | | | Total | In Progress (fiscal years) | | | | | | Total | Planned (fiscal years) | | | Total | Total Projects |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 66 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 71 | | 66 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 71 | | 69 | 70 | 71 | | |
| FY 1970 (51 States[1]) | 16 | 66 | 175 | 170 | 29 | | 456 | 10 | 33 | 108 | 238 | 330 | | 719 | 4 | 180 | | 184 | 1,359 |
| FY 1971 (48 States[2]) | 6 | 37 | 109 | 186 | 223 | 23 | 584 | 5 | 10 | 56 | 118 | 291 | 335 | 815 | 1 | 1 | 141 | 143 | 1,542[3] |

[1] States not reporting: Alaska, New Jersey, and Guam.
[2] States not reporting: Illinois, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota and Vermont.
[3] This total does not include 24 projects that were cancelled during FY 1971 (5 FY 1968 projects, 9 FY 1969 projects, 6 FY 1970 projects, and 4 FY 1971 projects).

## Table 2. Disposition of Institutional Proposals for CSCE Projects in FY 1971

| | Number | Federal Funds Requested (in millions of dollars) |
|---|---|---|
| Proposals received[1] | 1,093 | $20.23 |
| Proposals approved and funded[2] | 493 | 13.34 |
| Proposals approved and not funded | 338 | 6.89 |
| Proposals not approved | 262 | N.A. |

[1] 48 states reporting.
[2] Of the sums requested only $8.40 million were available.

## Table 3. Number of Projects by Geographic Area Served

| Area Served | FY 1968 Number | FY 1968 Percentage | FY 1969 Number | FY 1969 Percentage | FY 1970 Number | FY 1970 Percentage | FY 1971 Number | FY 1971 Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Urban | 378 | 52 | 364 | 56 | 284 | 47 | 198 | 36 |
| Urban/Suburban | 95 | 14 | 50 | 7 | 61 | 10 | 75 | 14 |
| Rural | 59 | 8 | 58 | 9 | 66 | 11 | 68 | 13 |
| Comprehensive | 187 | 26 | 181 | 28 | 199 | 32 | 204 | 37 |
| TOTALS | 719 | 100 | 653 | 100 | 610 | 100 | 545 | 100 |

**Table 4. Distribution of Federal Funds by Geographic Area Served (In Millions of Dollars)**

| Area Served | FY 1968 Federal Funds | FY 1968 Percentage | FY 1969 Federal Funds | FY 1969 Percentage | FY 1970 Federal Funds | FY 1970 Percentage | FY 1971 Federal Funds | FY 1971 Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Urban | $4.8 | 55 | $5.1 | 60 | $4.27 | 51 | $3.47 | 41 |
| Urban/Suburban | 1.1 | 12 | .1 | 6 | .83 | 10 | 1.14 | 14 |
| Rural | .7 | 8 | .6 | 7 | .85 | 10 | .88 | 10 |
| Comprehensive | 2.2 | 25 | 2.3 | 27 | 2.53 | 29 | 2.91 | 35 |
| TOTALS | $8.8 | 100 | $8.5 | 100 | $8.48 | 100 | $8.40 | 100 |

**Table 5. Number of State Approved Projects (By Problem Area and Fiscal Year of Funding)**

| Problem Area | FY 1968 | FY 1969 | FY 1970 | FY 1971 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Community Development | 173 | 177 | 152 | 138 |
| Education* | -- | -- | 42 | 39 |
| Employment | 16 | 22 | 10 | 17 |
| Economic Development | 17 | 22 | 27 | 22 |
| Government | 227 | 152 | 90 | 71 |
| Health | 60 | 45 | 44 | 36 |
| Housing | 5 | 4 | 7 | 6 |
| Human Relations | 31 | 42 | 47 | 44 |
| Land Use | 43 | 23 | 35 | 47 |
| Poverty | 25 | 33 | 36 | 32 |
| Personal Development | 35 | 58 | 73 | 65 |
| Recreation | 37 | 33 | 17 | 10 |
| Transportation | 7 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| Youth Opportunities | 43 | 40 | 27 | 17 |
| TOTALS | 719 | 653 | 610 | 545 |

*Separate category started in FY 1970 for projects related to the education system, most of which were previously included in the "Government" category.

**Table 6. Distribution of Federal and Local Program Funds for State Approved Projects (By Problem Area and Fiscal Year of Funding) (In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Problem Areas | FY 1968 Federal Funds | FY 1968 Local Funds | FY 1969 Federal Funds | FY 1969 Local Funds | FY 1970 Federal Funds | FY 1970 Local Funds | FY 1971 Federal Funds | FY 1971 Local Funds |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Community Development | $2,763.1 | $2,943.5 | $3,063.1 | $2,162.6 | $2,741.3 | $1,934.9 | $2,688.8 | $1,969.2 |
| Education* | | | | | 510.5 | 360.7 | 525.5 | 381.8 |
| Employment | 226.7 | 303.1 | 264.4 | 188.9 | 100.8 | 51.9 | 224.5 | 166.4 |
| Economic Development | 221.6 | 221.7 | 206.7 | 180.0 | 316.3 | 266.1 | 284.0 | 162.7 |
| Government | 2,462.4 | 2,505.5 | 1,698.7 | 1,356.8 | 1,397.1 | 864.8 | 1,133.9 | 736.7 |
| Health | 516.7 | 527.0 | 417.0 | 379.7 | 345.4 | 192.8 | 426.1 | 607.6 |
| Housing | 65.4 | 65.4 | 13.0 | 10.1 | 70.5 | 72.8 | 65.2 | 63.5 |
| Human Relations | 297.3 | 314.3 | 694.9 | 566.4 | 614.5 | 379.3 | 551.5 | 431.6 |
| Land Use | 417.8 | 523.3 | 203.3 | 122.5 | 397.2 | 266.7 | 637.3 | 527.0 |
| Poverty | 390.3 | 409.2 | 421.5 | 269.6 | 560.3 | 335.7 | 594.9 | 378.3 |
| Personal Development | 481.1 | 515.5 | 762.3 | 578.9 | 774.3 | 691.5 | 919.9 | 623.5 |
| Recreation | 329.3 | 353.7 | 326.0 | 229.3 | 191.9 | 136.9 | 94.7 | 75.9 |
| Transportation | 68.7 | 145.6 | 4.6 | 2.8 | 46.8 | 42.5 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Youth Opportunities | 483.7 | 515.9 | 428.5 | 383.9 | 420.7 | 307.0 | 241.8 | 133.8 |
| TOTALS | $8,778.1 | $9,343.7 | $8,504.0 | $6,431.5 | $8,487.5 | $5,903.6 | $8,400.1 | $6,270.0 |

*Separate category started in FY 1970 for programs related to the education system most of which were previously included in the "Government" category.

**Table 7. Number and Type of Participating Institutions (By Fiscal Year of Funding)**

| Type of Institution | FY 1968* Number | FY 1968* Percentage | FY 1969* Number | FY 1969* Percentage | FY 1970 Number | FY 1970 Percentage | FY 1971 Number | FY 1971 Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Land Grant and State Univs. | 85 | 21 | 79 | 22 | 90 | 18 | 87 | 17 |
| Four Year Public Insts. | 138 | 34 | 108 | 31 | 134 | 27 | 161 | 30 |
| Four Year Private Insts. | 120 | 30 | 105 | 30 | 169 | 34 | 169 | 32 |
| Two year Public Insts. | 53 | 13 | 46 | 14 | 96 | 19 | 102 | 19 |
| Two Year Private Insts. | 8 | 2 | 13 | 3 | 12 | 2 | 12 | 2 |
| TOTALS | 404 | 100 | 351 | 100 | 501 | 100 | 531 | 100 |

*Distributions for FY 1968-69 include only those institutions receiving Federal funds while the FY 1970 and FY 1971 distributions include all primary and cooperating institutions. Comparable figures for FY 1968 and FY 1969 were 447 and 454 institutions respectively.

**Table 8. Distribution of Federal Program Funds by Type of Participating Institution (By Fiscal Year of Funding) (In Thousands of Dollars)**

| Type of Institution | FY 1968 Federal Funds | FY 1968 Percentage | FY 1969 Federal Funds | FY 1969 Percentage | FY 1970 Federal Funds | FY 1970 Percentage | FY 1971 Federal Funds | FY 1971 Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Land Grant and State Univs. | $4,526.6 | 51.7 | $4,226.4 | 49.7 | $4,047.2 | 47.7 | $3,522.7 | 41.9 |
| Four Year Public Insts. | 1,935.8 | 22.1 | 1,717.8 | 20.2 | 1,824.3 | 21.5 | 2,016.7 | 24.0 |
| Four Year Private Insts. | 1,711.1 | 19.5 | 1,777.3 | 20.9 | 1,824.5 | 21.5 | 2.027.4 | 24.2 |
| Two Year Private Insts. | 538.9 | 6.1 | 663.3 | 7.8 | 752.2 | 8.8 | 790.5 | 9.4 |
| Two Year Private Insts. | 48.4 | .6 | 119.1 | 1.4 | 39.3 | .5 | 42.8 | .5 |
| TOTALS | $8,760.8 | 100 | $8,503.9 | 100 | $8,487.5 | 100 | $8,400.1 | 100 |

**Table 9. Source of Matching Funds For Community Service and Continuing Education Projects Completed in Fiscal Year 1971**

| Source of Matching Funds | No. of Projects | (%)* |
|---|---|---|
| Institutional Funds | 396 | (79.6) |
| State/Local Government Funds | 57 | (11.5) |
| Fees | 15 | (3.1) |
| Private Funds | 14 | (2.8) |
| Misc. Combinations | 15 | (3.0) |
| TOTALS | 497 | (100.0) |

*Based on responses from 43 states.

## Table 10. Distribution of funds under P.L. 89-329, Higher Education Act, as amended Title I, Community Services and Continuing Education FY 1971

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education | | | $ 100,000 |
| 50 States, D.C., and Outlying Areas | | | $9,400,000[1] |
| Alabama | 172,970 | New Mexico | 120,594 |
| Alaska | 105,718 | New York | 476,782 |
| Arizona | 134,537 | North Carolina | 206,305 |
| Arkansas | 141,084 | North Dakota | 112,928 |
| California | 497,355 | Ohio | 319,821 |
| Colorado | 142,825 | Oklahoma | 152,666 |
| Connecticut | 161,347 | Oregon | 141,519 |
| Delaware | 111,043 | Pennsylvania | 343,439 |
| Florida | 228,660 | Rhode Island | 118,812 |
| Georgia | 194,869 | South Carolina | 155,297 |
| Hawaii | 116,057 | South Dakota | 113,778 |
| Idaho | 114,689 | Tennessee | 181,879 |
| Illinois | 327,030 | Texas | 328,170 |
| Indiana | 204,938 | Utah | 121,361 |
| Iowa | 157,493 | Vermont | 108,888 |
| Kansas | 147,466 | Virginia | 195,387 |
| Kentucky | 166,796 | Washington | 168,287 |
| Louisiana | 176,865 | West Virginia | 137,687 |
| Maine | 120,262 | Wisconsin | 187,245 |
| Maryland | 176,989 | Wyoming | 106,671 |
| Massachusetts | 212,666 | District of Columbia | 116,616 |
| Michigan | 279,689 | | |
| Minnesota | 175,891 | | |
| Mississippi | 148,667 | | |
| Missouri | 195,511 | Outlying Areas: | |
| Montana | 114,420 | American Samoa | 25,597 |
| Nebraska | 130,104 | Canal Zone | 00 |
| Nevada | 109,302 | Guam | 26,948 |
| New Hampshire | 114,565 | Puerto Rico | 80,877 |
| New Jersey | 246,478 | Virgin Islands | 26,160 |

[1] Distribution of $9,400,000 with a basic amount of $100,000 to the 50 States and D.C.; $25,000 to American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and the balance distributed on the basis of estimated total resident population.



ERIC Clearinghouse
MAY 3 0 1972
on Adult Education